



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

ATHLETIC RECREATION ROOM
7154-17
PLEASE DO NOT TAKE TO
PRIVATE ROOM

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

JUNE 1962

THE DETROIT JEA MEETING

INTEGRATING OUR EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES

JESUIT IMPACT ON AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

JESUIT SCHOOLS OF THE WORLD: 1961

THE HIGH SCHOOL SODALITY DILEMMA

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

Vol. XXV, No. 1

(FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION)

Our Contributors

THE RIGHT REVEREND WILLIAM J. McDONALD, PH.D., is the Rector of the Catholic University of America and President of The International Association of Catholic Universities. Monsignor McDonald's address was delivered at the Dinner Meeting of the 1962 JEA Annual Meeting on Easter Monday, April 23, 1962, at the University of Detroit.

FATHER CARL J. BURLAGE, S.J., Assistant Professor of Philosophy and Director of the Honors Program at Loyola University of Chicago, delivered his address as the keynote address at the opening meeting of the 1962 JEA Annual Meeting. The address was delivered at the University of Detroit High School auditorium on Easter Sunday evening, April 22, 1962.

FATHER WILLIAM C. MCCUSKER, S.J., the High School Commentator, is Principal of Regis High School, New York City.

FATHER THOMAS L. O'BRIEN, S.J., the Commentator for Higher Education, is the Director of the Honors Program at Seattle University. Both Father O'Brien's and Father McCusker's papers were delivered on Easter Sunday evening at the University of Detroit High School.

FATHER MARTIN F. HASTING, S.J., the writer of the general article on the 1962 JEA Annual Meeting, is the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at St. Louis University.

FATHER WILLIAM J. MEHOK, S.J., continues his series of statistical studies on the Jesuit schools of the world. Father Mehok, stationed in the Curia at Rome, is former managing editor of the JEQ. Previous articles in this series published in previous issues of the JEQ are listed as a footnote to Father Mehok's article.

FATHER JOHN E. BECKER, S.J., is a Fourth Year Father at St. Mary's, Kansas. A member of the Missouri Province, Father Becker had his regency at St. Louis University High School.

339318

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

June 1962

CONTENTS

THE ANNUAL JEA MEETING AT DETROIT

Martin F. Hastings, S.J. 5

INTEGRATING OUR EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES FOR THE EFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS

Carl J. Burlage, S.J. 17

THE HIGH SCHOOL COMMENTS

William J. McCusker, S.J. 26

THE UNIVERSITY COMMENTS

Thomas L. O'Brien, S.J. 32

THE JESUIT IMPACT ON AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION AS SEEN BY A CATHOLIC CO-WORKER

Right Reverend William J. McDonald 38

JESUIT SCHOOLS OF THE WORLD: 1961

William J. Mehok, S.J. 42

THE HIGH SCHOOL SODALITY DILEMMA

John E. Becker, S.J. 57

NEWS FROM THE FIELD 67

THE JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY, published in June, October, January, and March by the Jesuit Educational Association, represents the Jesuit secondary schools, colleges, seminaries, and universities of the United States, and those conducted by American Jesuits in foreign lands.

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor

EDWARD B. ROONEY, S.J.

Assistant Editor

PAUL A. FITZGERALD, S.J.

Managing Editor

EUGENE F. MANGOLD, S.J.

Advisory Board

An editorial advisory board is composed of the regional directors of education in the several Jesuit provinces:

JAMES L. BURKE, S.J.	<i>New England Province</i>
CORNELIUS J. CARR, S.J.	<i>Buffalo Province</i>
BERNARD J. DOOLEY, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
JOSEPH K. DRANE, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
JOSEPH D. FITZGERALD, S.J.	<i>New England Province</i>
JOSEPH C. GLOSE, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
HERMAN J. HAUCK, S.J.	<i>California Province</i>
JOHN M. HYNES, S.J.	<i>California Province</i>
LEO B. KAUFMANN, S.J.	<i>Oregon Province</i>
ADRIAN J. KOCHANSKI, S.J.	<i>Wisconsin Province</i>
JULIAN L. MALINE, S.J.	<i>Detroit Province</i>
FREDERICK P. MANION, S.J.	<i>Chicago Province</i>
LORENZO K. REED, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
WILLIAM D. RYAN, S.J.	<i>Missouri Province</i>
PAUL V. SIEGFRIED, S.J.	<i>Detroit Province</i>
JOHN F. SULLIVAN, S.J.	<i>Chicago Province</i>
JAMES F. WHELAN, S.J.	<i>New Orleans Province</i>

ADDRESS COMMUNICATIONS TO THE EDITOR

49 East 84th Street, New York 28, N.Y.

COPYRIGHT, 1962

JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY

The Annual Meeting at Detroit

MARTIN F. HASTING, S.J.

The 1962 JEA Annual Meeting, convened in Detroit, April 22-23, centered on the theme, INTEGRATING OUR EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES FOR EFFECTIVE STUDENT DEVELOPMENT.

A new format was devised for this meeting, with a keynote address calculated to touch off discussion, complemented by comments designed to widen and deepen provocative questions raised in the introductory presentation. Homogeneous round tables composed of representatives from schools of higher education and of secondary schools, followed by general meetings of the college-university and secondary school representatives, discussed these questions in detail.

In his keynote address, Father Carl J. Burlage, S.J., Assistant Professor of Philosophy, and Director of the Honors Program at Loyola University, Chicago, focused on elements in the Jesuit educational system which he suggested might be adjusted. His purpose was to provide provocative points of discussion; and, judging from the sessions which followed, he did do this.

One of the first points he made was that our concern should be with the integration of the resources which we *now* actively possess and not with some abstract and ideal educational system. Tracing the historical development of the Jesuit educational system, he stressed the Ignatian determination to present a uniform pattern of response to a rather definite set of historical social needs. This tradition, he believed, has been maintained in America modified, however, by the peculiar conditions of American development. He noted that one of the first concerns of education in America had been to assure the training of candidates for the priesthood and religious life, with a subsidiary interest, to preserve the faith of the Catholic element in America.

Emphasis was placed on the fact that the American Jesuit educational institutions more generally conformed to the Medieval and traditional American educational patterns, concerned with providing a system *really* possible, rather than on the Platonic academy, intent on pursuing the humanistic ideal "of providing the perfect climate for the flowering of the fully developed human person."

Another point was made that the American Jesuit educational tradition was not really concerned with scholarship as such, but was oriented

rather towards the fulfilling of practical needs in a rapidly developing complex society, so that it could be described as somewhat analogous to the development of Agricultural and Mechanical institutions in the American system. And—"no real re-thinking or re-dedication of educational institutions from this original finality" has been made in our day. Though Jesuit institutions have grown quantitatively, they have not grown qualitatively. Their stress is not upon the ideal of a completely humanistic training, but rather upon the "services" rendered to the various communities in which they are located.

The keynoter emphasized that American Jesuit educational enterprise has been, in the main, neither very original nor very fruitful, that the tendency has been to imitate the larger and richer American educational institutions, following them at a slow pace due partly to lack of financial resources and to "a sincere and at least sometimes well-founded conservatism." As a consequence, it is often difficult to distinguish the Jesuit educational institution from others. He posed the question of whether Jesuits are really intent on teaching the individual courses in a curriculum in a manner specifically identified as Catholic and as a matter of *principle*, or whether they have been content rather with "the provision of a religious *place* for the educational process" and have merely inserted "into the educational experience certain *Catholic* elements as an *addition* to the standard ingredients." This Catholic "difference" is not meaningless or unimportant, but it does not touch in a meaningful way the essential differences between a Jesuit education and that provided in secular institutions.

This does not call for a radical revision, however, of the American Jesuit historical educational posture.

It is not that we do not deserve any criticism, do not need any reform. But our fault is not in having the wrong ideal: it is in being insufficiently responsive to the demands our ideal puts upon us, if it is really and effectively to be realized in the evolved and evolving American and Catholic society we serve. We have been too little concerned with our precious Jesuit principle of maximum utility; too willing to adopt an attitude of mere passive acceptance of developments in American education and in our own schools; too disposed to continue going through the motions of traditional activity, without asking ourselves whether that activity really achieves any present purpose or not. In sum, we have been insufficiently realistic in pursuing our ideals, reluctant to face the difficult and challenging questions posed by changes in the society in which we operate, unwilling to make the hard choices that a realistic appraisal of the relationship between our resources, our opportunities, and our ideals would force upon us.

This realistic and urgent reappraisal will urge a concentration of Jesuit educational resources on a selected group of students and on areas which promise to provide the greatest opportunity to provide for them "specifically Catholic and religious development." In keeping with this, a serious consideration should be given to the kind of religion and theology programs offered in the curriculum.

Concretely, I suggest, this demands a conscious, systematic and formalized effort on our part to locate and attract those Catholic students who offer the greatest promise of achieving in American society the influence of Catholic ideals, and the provision of the kind of educational experience such students really need. The Honors Programs of various sorts that have been introduced in our schools and colleges clearly represent a step in this direction, but it is a step that needs to be followed up consistently and thoroughly both in terms of recruitment and in terms of providing really effective educational programs for the contemporary Catholic students we enroll in these special as well as in our general curricula.

To assure realistic adjustments, an unconcern for tradition might be a very healthy attitude and programs or courses should not be maintained in the curriculum simply because this was the way it was always done. Concomitant with this a re-thinking of the use of Jesuit manpower would be in order, so that Jesuits might be assigned to areas to which they have been specifically and adequately trained and laymen used in areas where they could serve equally as well as Jesuits.

There can be no doubt that the participation of laymen and women in our educational efforts will continue to be not only of importance, but of ever-increasing importance in the future. We ought not to regard this situation as a kind of necessary evil to be tolerated; we ought to see in it a great opportunity for enlarging the effectiveness of Jesuit educational efforts, and promoting the good of our students. Perhaps we can even find here an area where Jesuit education can exhibit that originality and fruitfulness whose general absence from our history we noted earlier. Is it not time for us to institute and develop, even on a nationally cooperative scale, programs for identifying and promoting 'vocations' to our educational apostolate?

This would entail not only a diligent search in Jesuit schools "for men and women of talent for teaching and administration," but the training and inspiring of them to make their own the ideals and attitudes that must dominate and motivate Jesuit education. This should be the concern of the *present* as well as of the future, so that the faculty now serving should be given as full an understanding as possible of Jesuit aims.

Father Burlage, in a concluding paragraph, summarized his general concern:

It is perhaps not necessary to point out, with Senator Sumner, that 'an immense space has been traversed.' The entire purpose of our long journey has, however, been a relatively simple one. It has been our thesis that 'integrating our educational resources for effective student development' does not demand of us any revolutionary re-assessment of the historical purposes of American Jesuit education: rather it demands of us a sincere re-dedication to those identical purposes. But such a re-dedication requires more than mere assent to a laudable objective. It requires us to seek *understanding* of the most realistic sort of what our resources are, what the actual needs of our students in the American society of the present are; it requires us to exercise *prudence* in utilizing those resources to meet the needs of our students; it requires *courage* to make the hard choices which prudence dictates. Only if we can bring all of these to the multiple and complex problems that confront us as Jesuit educators will we be able to fulfill our real vocation: the actual achievement in the present of the ideals of our past.

COMMENTS ON FATHER BURLAGE'S PAPER

Reverend Thomas L. O'Brien, S.J.

Reverend Thomas L. O'Brien, S.J., Director of the Honors Program, Seattle University, made the point that our day is an era of ecumenism in religion, politics, international affairs, and industrial society. As a consequence, this calls for intellectual ecumenism—true integration. He took sharp objection to Father Burlage's analysis that Jesuit education was historically content merely to imitate the disintegrated separatism of secular schools. Whatever the past, in this instance, it proves nothing of the future. The Constitutions of the Society, the Spiritual Exercises, and the Ratio of 1599 constantly emphasize the flexibility inherent in the growth potential of every human being in different times and different places and the Ignatian concern to produce instruments uniquely fitted to meet these changing circumstances.

To the question of what demands should be made on personal Christian leadership in a fragmented society, the answer is to supply the ability to integrate moral, business and political life; science, philosophy and theology; metaphysics, ethics and epistemology; faith and basic human concerns. The central dogma supplying reality as the matrix of integration is Christ, the Incarnate Word, unchanging in a real, changing, physical universe.

The purpose of Jesuit education as Saint Ignatius indicated in the Fourth Part of the Constitutions, is "to aid its own members and their

fellow men to attain the ultimate end for which they were created." To do this effectively it must be centered on Christ. "And the Mind of Christ is the mind of unity, not of fragmentation."

It is a responsibility of Jesuit educational institutions, following the pattern established by Saint Ignatius, to lead rather than follow secular schools in establishing educational patterns. This involved in a world dominated by skepticism the re-introduction of Christian directionalism. It is the concern of the Jesuit institution to supply certitude, for "without certitude, there is no freedom and without freedom there can be no free society. . . . But this certitude ultimately rests on an integration between faith and reason, and between reason and science, and between all of these and the arts."

One way of achieving this is to integrate studies laterally among the four "virtue-areas" of analytic thought, symbolic thought, historic thought, and scientific thought. This lateral integration, however, must be supported by an historical integration.

A particular problem of the superior and talented student is "the passive posture developed during the twelve years of listening and repeating pre-arranged answers." This must be overcome by creating the attitude of inquiry and research. This will be done not by imitating the disintegration of secular colleges, but in a quite contrary fashion, by giving the example of complete integration.

In his conclusion, Father O'Brien ventured to give answers to the questions provided in the pre-convention considerations. They were:

1. It is not enough to 'rely on the student' to achieve his own integration, since integration is the fruit of wisdom, the most difficult and subtle of the intellectual virtues.
2. There is no real conflict between the 'integrity of the subject matter' and the 'development of the student'—each rather contributes to each.
3. The 'historical approach' is the more effective pedagogy, since the individual human mind develops analogously with the gradually developing 'historical mind' from the less to the more complex.
4. There need be no conflict between faculty 'stated commitments' and 'objectivity in instructing,' since the human corporate insight, developing under Divine Providence, provides at one and the same time for faculty 'commitment' and 'objectivity.'

REJOINDER

In response to the comment of Father O'Brien, Father Burlage replied that he did not see a great divergence between his and Father O'Brien's

positions. He insisted that he was not making a point of "passive acceptance" of departmentalized education, but rather meant to point towards "active acceptance," that is, the recognition and utilization of educational procedures originating outside the Jesuit tradition but within the framework of the American experience—to find real values in the accepted patterns of American education, to improve them and to make the best possible use of them for Jesuit purposes.

"Integration does not imply only unity but insists upon difference. . . . Activities can be integrated only in terms of achievement and harmonious relationship between a *variety* of elements, not by reducing this variety to a simplist or even monist unity." The various disciplines and activities should be preserved and respected. "Integration-in-the-person" must be distinguished from "integration-in-the-curriculum." The first, "insofar as it is attained by formal education at all, is achieved not by this or that course, not even by the academic curriculum as a whole, but by the total educational experience in the classroom and out of it." "Integration-in-the-curriculum" is best achieved through various disciplines, *directly* through the departments of theology and philosophy. "The development of 'the whole man' (in Christ) is the task of the whole Christian university."

Reverend William C. McCusker, S.J.

Father McCusker, Principal, Regis High School, New York, initiated his discussion with a recollection of some of the points made in the report of the JEA Secondary School Commission at the previous annual JEA meeting. These included general improvement of the curriculum, the promotion of curriculum enrichment, and the upgrading of modern foreign languages.

To effect curricular growth and change, several avenues of approach are possible. The first is to let others do the experimentation, then follow slowly in their wake, learning from their errors and successes. The second is to step out boldly and take the lead, for instance, in the development of a four-year modern language program.

The third is to revive the one-time Jesuit system of close integration between high school and college in which very often a student moved from one to the other without any change of locale, emphasis, and, on occasion, faculty in the program. In this instance, the Jesuit secondary school was almost exclusively concerned with college preparatory work, stressing those disciplines which would enable the student to pursue a strong liberal arts program.

Other methods of achieving excellence would be to take advantage of technological advances such as educational television and modern teaching aids, and to use new teaching methods such as programmed instruction and team teaching. This last would allow for the utilization of the best teachers for more students, training of younger teachers under the supervision of a more experienced master-teacher, and the possibility of recruiting undergraduate students, serving as cadets, as future secondary school instructors. In-service development, exchange of personnel, assigning of lay teachers to fields commonly reserved for Jesuit priests (such as guidance and testing programs) would make for greater utilization of the manpower resources available.

ADDRESS OF MONSIGNOR WILLIAM J. McDONALD

In the concluding session of the JEA meeting, Monsignor William J. McDonald, Rector of the Catholic University of America, addressed himself to the theme of "The Jesuit Impact on American Higher Education As Seen by a Catholic Co-Worker."

Monsignor McDonald in his introduction expressed his gratitude to the Jesuits for their services on the staff of the Catholic University of America, the inspiration of the Jesuit graduate students at that University, the support and cooperation given him as editor-in-chief of *The New Catholic Encyclopedia*, and the friendly collaboration of all the great Jesuit universities throughout the world which he experienced as the President of the Federation of Catholic Universities.

Starting from the point that the foundation which underlies all true education, as Pope Pius XI indicated in *Divini Illius Magistri*, is "the proper and immediate aim to form Christ in the soul of the baptized person," he concluded that Catholic education "must be shot through with a spiritual quality that pervades, permeates, and penetrates all that we do." Catholics have a command to love God with their whole minds; and this is sometimes forgotten.

Against this background, Monsignor outlined some areas in which he thought there would be general agreement:

First, that Catholic "efforts in formal education are in the largest sense missionary, that is, looking ultimately to the conversion of our country."

Second, "the spreading of the gospel has always involved the question of the degree of adaption, of how far we should go in making concessions to the alien environment which is the object of our missionary efforts."

Third, that differences on this question are historically as ancient as the Church and reflect the conflicts engendered by the Reformation.

He also pointed out areas in which there might be some dispute:

First, that there is a "tendency within and outside the Society to accept too many features of the culture which is the immediate object of our missionary effort."

Second, that there are differences of approach to contemporary America. For instance, there are those who would be concerned in developing *Catholic Americanism*, or baptizing contemporary pragmatism and secularism; those interested in the improvement and development of *American Catholicism*; and those who tend to put specific aims and goals over and above those of Catholicism at large.

Third, "the tendency to remove *potentially* good administrators at too early a stage from their scholarly careers and to have them concentrate on administration, sometimes without sufficient understanding of higher educational policy and problems . . . and the tendency to fill administrative and teaching posts indiscriminately."

Fourth, the secularizing tendency in attempting to make institutions Catholic "Harvards."

Fifth, the willingness to cooperate with secular institutions at any price.

Sixth, the seduction of bigness, that is, to extend indiscriminately without real regard for the central purpose of the institution and to multiply educational institutions too rapidly.

In his concluding summary, the Monsignor placed this challenge before Jesuit educators:

In that future, the Jesuit educational system, with a university and liberal arts tradition dating back to the days of its founder, will be called upon to play an ever more important role in Catholic higher education. The unique resources and the disciplined zeal of the Society must contribute the maximum to the attainment of the common goal which the Church has given to all of us, namely, the most effective development of those fellow Catholics committed to our care. This will not be done by shouting or waving banners, *non in commotione Deus*. If any of us should be tempted to make extravagant claims or to speak in terms of educational perfection we would do well to read again that striking passage in Cardinal Newman's *Idea of a University*: ' . . . One only among the sons of men has carried out a perfect work, and satisfied and exhausted the mission on which He came. One alone has with His last breath said "Consummatum est." But all who set about their duties in faith and hope and love, with a resolute heart and a devoted will, are able, weak though they be, to do what, though incomplete, is imperishable. Even their failures become successes, as being necessary steps in a course, and as terms (so to say) in a long series, which will at length fulfill the object which

they propose. And they will unite themselves in spirit, in their humble degree, with those real heroes of Holy Writ and ecclesiastical history, Moses, Elias, and David, Basil, Athanasius and Chrysostom, Gregory the Seventh, St. Thomas of Canterbury, and many others, who did most when they fancied themselves least prosperous, and died without being permitted to see the fruit of their labors.'

ROUND TABLE DISCUSSIONS

The Easter Monday morning sessions were devoted to round table discussions, with each group discussing a certain portion of the topics submitted before the meeting. The general consensus of all panels was that one of the most necessary and useful projects which could be undertaken by the JEA would be to prepare a clear, precise definition of the objectives of Jesuit education, this despite the many things that have been written on the topic.

Colleges and Universities

INTEGRATING RESOURCES IN GENERAL ADMINISTRATION:

"Ultimate responsibility" has to be understood within the framework of the governmental structure of the Society of Jesus. The ultimate decision is that of the Rector; boards are of an advisory nature only. Local conditions and circumstances would determine the actual working arrangement in each institution. External pressures from accrediting agencies, state departments of education, and professional groups (such as the American Chemical Society) might limit freedom of action in the structuring of a curriculum.

To the question as to the extent to which top level decisions are sometimes made with inadequate reference to student developmental factors, discussion generally centered around such concerns as the make-up of the student body as a determining element. Caution was suggested that, in a complex institution, flexibility must be maintained to give maximum education to students of various abilities.

Adequate measurement of the performance of students after graduation presents many difficulties. Some approximation is easier to obtain in regard to superior students who compete for scholarships, go to graduate schools, etc. The performance of the average student can probably only be determined after many years by the civic responsibility assumed, success, contributions in Catholicism, etc.

INTEGRATING RESOURCES IN SPECIAL AREAS OF ADMINISTRATION:

Constant re-evaluation of the curriculum is necessary. Pressures such as those effected by outside agencies, the fad factor, empire building, pose problems in structuring a solid curriculum.

The number and quality of students effect curriculum planning and, in certain instances, might point towards a multi-level program to take care of the superior student, the average student and the student in need of some remedial work. Honors and tutorial programs are expensive but the investment is worthwhile. There was considerable division of opinion on the question of whether or not evening schools do or can provide the same quality of education as the day divisions.

In the recruitment of faculty, a more serious effort to determine the philosophy of prospective faculty should be made, especially in such sensitive areas as philosophy, psychology, sociology, and literature. A continuing orientation program for faculty, old and new, centered around the philosophy of Jesuit education, would help to assure a better understanding of Jesuit education. A handy guide for administrators to be used as background resource for the orientation of new faculty could be compiled from the JEA's Deans' Meetings.

INTEGRATING RESOURCES IN INSTRUCTION:

There was a consensus that a distinction should be made between the integration of the person and the integration of the curriculum. The integration of the person would be effected by the whole apparatus of the curriculum and the agency of the intellect. Superior students probably would be capable of performing this integration almost by themselves. Integration within the curriculum would be achieved by the disciplines of philosophy and theology. The courses within these disciplines should be carefully investigated, however, to see whether or not they serve this purpose of integration. Other means of assuring integration within the curriculum are inter-disciplinary study programs, team teaching, and continuing inter-disciplinary faculty seminars.

The distinction between graduate and undergraduate work is diminishing due, in part, to the increasing number of undergraduate students of superior ability who take graduate level work, and encouragement of independent study programs.

In general, the main obstacles to integration seem to be the insistence on autonomy by the various academic departments, lack of communication between departments, critical shortages of Jesuits trained in theology and philosophy, and the absence of clearly defined institutional objectives.

Commission on Liberal Arts and the Commission on Graduate Schools

Father Lawrence W. Friedrich, S.J., Dean of the Graduate School, Marquette University, described the Marquette Institute for the Recruitment of Teachers in Undergraduate Schools patterned on the plan of Professor Totaro of the University of Wisconsin. Some questions were raised about the Totaro plan, especially since it involves the prolongation and breaking up of the participants' graduate programs.

Father Victor J. Blum, S.J., Dean of the Institute of Technology, Saint Louis University, reported on the status of engineering education in Jesuit schools and on the methods used to obtain integration. Three levels of integration were outlined: within the engineering curriculum, between high school-university-industry and between university and industrial communities. In the training of an engineer a two-fold goal is predicated—that of providing a person with technological skills of high quality and with a sense of real social responsibility. The broadening of engineering education to include more of the humanistic studies, a development of the twentieth century, is due to the fact “that it was deemed essential for engineers to possess gentlemanly culture, ability to think more effectively, greater potential in the business world, and a more active sense of civic responsibility.”

Jesuit Secondary Schools

The representatives of the secondary schools directed their discussions to two aspects of effective student development:

1. Responsibility
2. Methodologies or Procedures

RESPONSIBILITY

A critical point for unified and effective administration is the clear determination of the areas of delegated authority in academic matters by the Rector to the Principal, in each instance worked out on the local level.

A characteristic which distinguishes Jesuit institutions from other Catholic high schools is the degree to which the former develop in the students devotion to the Holy See, a humanistic frame of mind, logical thinking, competency in expression, good study habits, discipline and leadership, especially in religious affairs. This is effected through the distinctive Jesuit manner in which the subjects in the curriculum are taught, the philosophical and theological background of the Jesuit instructors, and the challenge of the Sodality, designed to produce Catholic leaders.

"Theory thinking," rather than practical execution, is a fairly general deficiency. The pressure of exacting schedules, routine and involvement in administrative and instructional detail work against acquiring the leisure helpful for formulating a philosophy of education and the formulation of long-range plans. To remedy this such devices might be used as: more training for administrators before appointment, orientation programs for faculty, continuing discussion of the Jesuit philosophy of education in carefully structured faculty meetings, Summer Institutes centered on subject matter, discipline, and extra-curricular activities.

METHODOLOGIES AND PROCEDURES

CURRICULUM PLANNING

The discipline of English seems to present the most serious problem of overlapping and repetition, due to the tendency on the part of instructors to stress the analysis of literature at the expense of training in the fundamentals of grammar and composition. The expansion of course offerings, in breadth and depth in the modern languages, using technological developments such as language laboratories, should be seriously considered.

Since accrediting agencies have fairly strict requirements regarding the training and case-load of counsellors, Jesuits assigned to this important office should be skilled in administering tests, competent in offering vocational guidance, conversant with college admissions procedures.

In order to capitalize on the results of teaching techniques and experiments and to assure better exchange of information beneficial to all the secondary schools, a staff man should be specifically assigned to this task in the JEA.

SUPERVISION

A real weakness in the assurance of more effective student development is a lack of adequate supervision of the instructional staff. To remedy this such devices might be used as team teaching, departmentalization with regularly scheduled departmental meetings, and organized classroom visitations with follow-up conferences.

STAFF GROWTH

Continual staff development is essential. This can be promoted through such means as departmental and subject-area meetings, reduction of teaching loads to allow for better preparation and more research, support for attendance at conventions, and encouragement to obtain fellowships, lectureships, and grants.

Integrating Our Educational Resources for the Effective Development of Students

CARL J. BURLAGE, S.J.

In the months that have passed since I first received Fr. Rooney's kind invitation to address this assembly, it has been my pleasure and pride to mention this occasion to a variety of people. Some of them were fellow-Jesuits; some of them were laymen and laywomen. Of this latter group, some were engaged directly in the enterprise of education; some were not. It may be of interest to you to know that I aroused in every instance a substantially identical response. When I told them what the topic was, they always asked, "What does it mean?" When I told them that the audience would be made up of Provincials, Rectors, Presidents, Vice-presidents, Deans, Principals, Prefects of Studies, they universally exclaimed (in one form of words or another), "Blast 'em!"

Now, I do not exactly agree that "blasting you" is the proper function of this keynote address, although some of you may feel before I am done that this is the net effect of what I have to say. On the other hand, I do conceive it to be my duty to set before you some thoughts about the meaning of the subject whose various ramifications we shall be considering tonight and tomorrow. As an initial way of penetrating that meaning, I should like to direct your attention to one single word in the topic set forth above, and that word almost the shortest one: the little possessive pronoun, "Our."

It will hardly be necessary to point out to this audience that a certain ambivalence is possible with regard to the interpretation of this word. Capitalize it, and we get a meaning which none of Ours will miss; leave it in small case, and we have another sense or at least another emphasis: our concern here is with *what we actually possess*: the resources we have, the students we have. We are *not* concerned with the speculative consideration of an abstractly ideal educational system: we *are* anxious to achieve the most effective results in the concrete practical situations which engage us.

There is a well known and somewhat sardonic view of human destiny summed up in the proverb, "Happy the country that has no history."

We might be disposed to make a special application of it and say, "Happy the school (or educational system) that has no history." The only trouble is that no such school exists. Our newest foundation comes into existence with a history ready-made, and whether we think this fact is "unhappy" or not, it is a fact. And we shall not justly appreciate our present position, or rightly estimate our present problems, unless we respect that fact.

It is not our purpose here to provide an exhaustive history of American Jesuit schools (accomplishing this would require at least a monograph devoted to each foundation), but it is our purpose to call attention to what seems to have been present in almost all those early foundations from which our present-day high schools, colleges and universities have developed. Those early and so-equivocally named "colleges" to which we can all trace our origin manifest a relatively uniform pattern of response to a rather definite set of social needs. In the correspondence between American bishops and the superiors of the Society we find two motives which seem to have been foremost in the minds of the former, and of great influence with the latter. First, there is the need of educating apt candidates for the priesthood and religious life, demanded in increasing numbers by the rapid numerical and geographical expansion of the nineteenth century American Catholic population. Second, "saving the faith" of a younger generation of Catholics rising from what may loosely be called "proletarian" to (equally loosely) "bourgeois" social and economic status, and demanding "education" as an instrument of this elevation.

A brief mention of what was not present in the initial formation of our instruments and resources of education may be almost as important as the consideration of what was. In the pragmatic American society, so devoted to "getting ahead," little attention should be expected, little is to be found, to the creation of abstractly "ideal" educational institutions. Not that our Jesuit forefathers were not interested in "the ideal" in the sense of "the best possible," but that their attention was primarily focussed on the *really possible*: what could actually be accomplished, what would be actually effective, in the concrete social situation confronting them. In this their foundations much more closely resemble medieval (and other American) educational institutions than they do the generally popular conception of a platonic "Academy" or those schools and colleges allegedly founded to pursue the humanist and renaissance ideal of providing the perfect climate for the flowering of "the fully developed human person." Neither do we find, if my reading of our history is right, much *real* concern with "scholarship"—with that disinterested and co-operative "pursuit of truth" latterly so much urged as the only proper

end at least of the university. Whatever is to be found of these aims (and I do not deny that something is to be found) is assimilated to and realized within the framework of the practical ends which were actually and principally operative in the foundation of our schools. While certainly not narrowly specialist and technical as the nineteenth century "Agricultural and Mechanical Institutes," our historical Jesuit educational foundations exhibit a certain valid analogy with these typically and uniquely American institutions. Our schools came into being as institutions for the "training" of young men (and, much later, young women) to assume their rightful and needful roles as Americans and Catholics in the ecclesiastical and civil social structure. It was this practical end which called them into existence and substantially determined, within the limits of the possible, their choice of educational instruments and "resources" of every kind.

I suggest to you that there has been, since this beginning a century and more ago, no real rethinking or rededicating of our educational institutions from this original finality. They have grown larger. They have increased in number. They have accumulated to themselves types of educational operations not contemplated as essential or even, perhaps, as possible by their founders. The specifically pre-clerical objective has become, with the passage of time and the development of other institutions for achieving it, less and less important, quantitatively if not qualitatively. But the other objective has survived, practically unchanged. The stress we find, for instance, in our prospectuses and appeals for funds on our "service" to the ecclesiastical (less and less) and the civil and even business (more and more) communities represents, I believe, more than a Public Relations "gimmick." It is, however unconsciously, the contemporary expression of the historical dedication with which we began.

This historical dedication has had a variety of results in the development of our American Jesuit educational "system." To carry it out, we have opened more and more essentially identical institutions in a variety of geographical locations. We have followed the Catholic population, and taken care to open our schools "where the boys are"—and where they really need us. We have added different curricula in the high schools and colleges *strictae dicta* and acquired or instituted new "schools" in our Universities as any of these seemed at a given point in time to represent possible and effective extensions of the socially useful activity of individual institutions.

It is perhaps another result of our pragmatic historical orientation that American Jesuit educational enterprise has been, in the main, neither very original nor very *fruitful*, using this latter term in the special mean-

ing which it has in contemporary science. Our history has not been characterized by innovations from within; our long experience in American Catholic education seems not to have generated any really *different* educational procedures in content or method. Our tendency has rather been to model our operations on those of other older, larger and richer American educational institutions, introducing the same innovations or modifications of curriculum and technique that they do, but at a somewhat slower pace—a slower pace no doubt partly to be accounted for by the limitations of our financial resources, partly also by a sincere and at least sometimes well-founded conservatism. Again I call as witness our catalogs, our public description of the means and opportunities for education which we offer to the students who come to us. Putting aside the lofty statements about religious and educational ideals which generally introduce them—I do not mean to suggest that these statements are not sincere—and examining our actual educational offerings, it is at once evident that we do not really claim to do anything very different from what the comparable non-Jesuit, even non-Catholic, institution does, even when, rightly or wrongly, we claim to do it better. The only difference is that we insist on applying the denomination “Catholic” to the education we propose.

I am not suggesting that this denomination is a meaningless or an unimportant one, but I am suggesting that it signifies less of a real difference in the conduct of education than is sometimes supposed. Is chemistry or medicine or law or history really taught differently *as a matter of principle* in a Jesuit school? (I am quite ready to admit a variety of differences in terms of individual teachers, but such differences are not relevant here.) Has not Jesuit education, Catholic education, in our history really meant just two things: the provision of a religious *place* for the educational process, and the insistence upon incorporating into the educational experience certain *Catholic* elements as an *addition* to the standard ingredients of an American education? In other words, we have provided locations where young Catholics may do, with less danger of religious loss and more hope of religious profit, what they are inevitably going to do anyway: get an education. And while they are doing this we also provide them with certain opportunities—of at least some of which they are usually required to avail themselves—to perfect, protect, and develop their religious faith and its expression in life: a schedule of courses in Philosophy and Theology or Religion—prayer and the crucifix in the classroom—the Sodality—the easy availability of the sacraments—religiously oriented counselling. . . . But you know the catalog of reli-

gious auxiliaries to the process of Catholic education at least as well as I do.

I repeat: this Catholic "difference" is not meaningless or unimportant. Indeed, in one way of looking at it, it is the most important consideration of all for the Jesuit educator. For if it is true that the general reason for the foundation of our schools was the need of young Catholics for *education*, the specific reason for Jesuits assuming the task of providing it was their realization that the education of young Catholics had to be Catholic. If the educational endeavor does not have or cannot receive this Catholic "denomination" in a meaningful way, Jesuits have no business engaging in it.

It may seem that the way has been prepared, at this point, for a radical criticism of the historical purposes and accomplishments of our American Jesuit schools, and for the sounding of a clarion call for a radical revision of our historical dedication which will eliminate once for all the possibility of referring to our schools in the public prints as "mass production" colleges. But this is not at all my purpose. On the contrary: I am convinced that our Jesuit forefathers were right: that our Jesuit schools and colleges are not and should not be thought of as self-contained and self-justified entities, but get their meaning and value from the service they perform, the needs they satisfy, in the ecclesiastical and civil societies whose instruments they are.

It is not that we do not deserve any criticism, do not need any reform. But our fault is not in having the wrong ideal: it is in being insufficiently responsive to the demands our ideal puts upon us, if it is really and effectively to be realized in the evolved and evolving American and Catholic society we serve. We have been too little concerned with our precious Jesuit principle of maximum utility; too willing to adopt an attitude of mere passive acceptance of developments in American education and in our own schools; too disposed to continue going through the motions of traditional activity, without asking ourselves whether that activity really achieves any present purpose or not. In sum, we have been insufficiently realistic in pursuing our ideals, reluctant to face the difficult and challenging questions posed by changes in the society in which we operate, unwilling to make the hard choices that a realistic appraisal of the relationship between our resources, our opportunities, and our ideals would force upon us.

It is obviously not possible in the time available to us here to attempt even a moderately comprehensive account of all the results of such a realistic appraisal. But I should like to try your patience a little farther by

at least suggesting certain areas where, it seems to me, this realistic appraisal, and a sincere and dedicated effort to implement its conclusions, are urgently and presently needed. If nothing else, they will serve as models for the kind of investigation and decision I am trying to urge upon you, patterns for the kind of decision we must make for the future good, the future real effectiveness, of American Jesuit education.

First of all, let us acknowledge that the problem of making American education Catholic has changed enormously with the passing of the years since our first "colleges" were founded. For one thing, the number of American Catholics to be educated has increased beyond the wildest dreams of a few generations ago; for another, the position of Catholics in American life has undergone a qualitative change even more significant for us as Jesuit educators than the mere increase in numbers. No longer are American Catholics an oppressed minority group struggling to achieve some kind of social and economic status in a Protestant society. If American life has become in general increasingly secularized, it has also become increasingly open in every area to penetration by the talent and energy of all Americans of whatever religious or national or even racial background. There is no area of opportunity for success, influence, power, closed to the contemporary American Catholic—and I feel sure I need not specify the most obvious concrete evidence for the truth of what I am saying.

This change in the size and character of the American Catholic population from which our students are drawn must be a matter of serious concern to us. First of all, it is evident that the maxim, "Every Catholic student in a Catholic school," is simply not a practical one, in view of the sheer number of Catholic students and the limitations of our educational resources, even if it were an abstractly desirable one—which in my opinion it is not. Accepting this evident fact must force upon us a series of decisions which we seem so far to have been unwilling to make. If we apply here our principle of maximum utility, must we not admit: first, that we are compelled to concentrate the educational resources we actually have upon a selected group of students? and, second, that we must concentrate our educational efforts in those areas which offer the maximum opportunity for realizing our goal of promoting the specifically Catholic and religious development of our students?

Concretely, I suggest, this demands a conscious, systematic and formalized effort on our part to locate and attract those Catholic students who offer the greatest promise of achieving in American society the influence of Catholic ideals, and the provision of the kind of educational experience such students really need. The Honors Programs of various

sorts that have been introduced in our schools and colleges clearly represent a step in this direction, but it is a step that needs to be followed up consistently and thoroughly both in terms of recruitment and in terms of providing really effective educational programs for the contemporary Catholic students we enroll in these special as well as in our general curricula. We must ask ourselves, for instance, whether the kind of religion or theology program which was designed largely to furnish weapons for Catholics forced to assume a negative and defensive ("Apologetic") attitude toward their faith is really adequate to the kind of "witness" demanded of our students in American society today. We must examine all the other Catholic "additions"—extra-curricular as well as curricular—to which we referred earlier as characterizing our educational efforts, with regard to their *real* effectiveness for our here-and-now students. We must be prepared to introduce modifications where modifications are needed; institute new programs where conditions demand them; abandon traditional modes of operation where these no longer have any real effect.

I would not have you understand me as advocating only that sort of modification of our educational procedures which might be thought of as a kind of patchwork-tinkering with their traditional fabric. We must apply the same considerations of the finite character of our resources, the achievement of maximum benefit from their employment, and the *de facto* needs of present-day students and present-day society, to every aspect of our operations. Every one of our schools needs to review the entire area of its activities, and make a realistic assessment of the proportion which exists between the physical and moral effort expended upon each of them and the actual contribution which it makes to *our* educational goal. Here we must not allow the fact that a certain sort of operation is "in possession," or that its abandonment might have a temporarily unfortunate public-relations effect, to have a disproportionate influence upon our decisions. Evidently, some educational activities impose a greater strain upon our resources than others; evidently also it is not always those which demand the most in terms of money, interest and effort which yield the greatest return for Catholic and Jesuit ends. I repeat that *our* concern with education is primarily the promotion of the good of religion. Can we then continue to invest a major portion of our means in educational enterprises of at best marginal religious utility?

The logical extension of our considerations brings us to a point with regard to which I am, at the present moment, not even willing exactly to offer a suggestion. Rather, I would simply invite you to say with me, "I wonder if . . . ?"

I think we will all admit that the most important, the most precious resource that Jesuit education has is . . . Jesuits. Must we not ask ourselves if we are presently using this resource most effectively for the development of our students? And if our answer to this question is in any degree in the negative, must we not further ask ourselves if the time has not come to modify our traditional policy of employing Jesuits in every sort of administrative and teaching activity, and to begin a systematic and continuing policy of concentrating Jesuit time and Jesuit energy in those areas most directly connected with our Jesuit educational goal? Might we not even suggest that Jesuit efforts are not being used with maximum effectiveness whenever the work that a Jesuit is engaged in could be done *equally as well* by someone other than a Jesuit?

Which brings me to the last point I shall propose for your consideration here. There can be no doubt that the participation of laymen and women in our educational efforts will continue to be not only of importance, but of ever-increasing importance in the future. We ought not to regard this situation as a kind of necessary evil to be tolerated; we ought to see in it a great opportunity for enlarging the effectiveness of Jesuit educational efforts, and promoting the good of our students. Perhaps we can even find here an area where Jesuit education can exhibit that originality and fruitfulness whose general absence from our history we noted earlier. Is it not time for us to institute and develop, even on a nationally co-operative scale, programs for identifying and promoting "vocations" to our educational apostolate? There is not only question here of finding in our high schools, colleges, graduate schools, men and women with talent for teaching and administration, and offering them the training, the inspiration, the moral and sometimes even material support necessary to prepare them to assume appropriate positions in our schools and colleges. All this is necessary, but something else is even more necessary: seeing that the men and women thus located and trained and inspired and supported have also every opportunity to know and to make their own the properly Catholic and Jesuit ideals and attitudes that must dominate and motivate Jesuit education. Nor should we be satisfied to develop such a program only for *future* lay teachers and administrators. We have an equal, even a greater obligation with respect to those dedicated and self-sacrificing men and women already engaged with us in the work of our schools and colleges and universities. To bring to them the fullest possible understanding of Jesuit aims—to associate them as closely as possible with the achievement of those aims—to give them every opportunity for full and free and responsible participation in the work which is truly ours but must be theirs also—these are objectives perhaps not easily achieved, and

certainly requiring new methods, new instrumentalities, if they are to be achieved at all. Nevertheless, they are objectives of pressing and immediate importance. If I may refer to the point made just above: I would suggest that Jesuit talent and Jesuit energy could nowhere be more profitably employed than in developing and implementing the means of making the increasing participation of laymen in the work of Jesuit education more and more effective for the good of our students.

It is perhaps not necessary to point out, with Senator Sumner, that "an immense space has been traversed." The entire purpose of our long journey has, however, been a relatively simple one. It has been our thesis that "integrating our educational resources for effective student development" does not demand of us any revolutionary re-assessment of the historical purposes of American Jesuit education: rather it demands of us a sincere re-dedication to those identical purposes. But such a re-dedication requires more than mere assent to a laudable objective. It requires us to seek *understanding* of the most realistic sort of what our resources are, what the actual needs of our students in the American society of the present are; it requires us to exercise *prudence* in utilizing those resources to meet the needs of our students; it requires *courage* to make the hard choices which prudence dictates. Only if we can bring all of these to the multiple and complex problems that confront us as Jesuit educators will we be able to fulfill our real vocation: the actual achievement in the present of the ideals of our past.

The starting assumption in the Catholic philosophy of education is the reality of the supernatural order as revealed through and in Jesus Christ. The Christian belief that man is a creature of God destined to share in the divine life answers the two questions upon which every philosophy of education must be built: What is man? What is his purpose? This truth then is the ultimate purpose and final objective of Christian education, and indeed, the theological integrating principle, the philosophical guide and the basic sanction of the moral order.

—N. G. McCluskey, S.J.

The High School Comments . . .

WILLIAM C. McCUSKER, S.J.

The basic notions expressed in Father Burlage's paper need few guidelines for proper application to the secondary school situation in the Provinces of the Society in the United States, and I suppose among our neighbor provinces and countries. Reference can easily be made by high school teachers and administrators without help from a Secondary School commentator. It would not be surprising if many of you would have discovered different areas of application and reference. However, since there must be comment, I would like to think of these few pages as my own "thinking aloud" or the combined reactions of some of my Faculty members. And no matter how the following sounds, it is by no means intended as telling Father Burlage "This is how you really should have said it."

At the outset, I would like to repeat the essence of the introductory remarks of last year's high school commentator, Father Sheahan, in whose giant-sized footsteps I follow. The following remarks, the suggestions, the references and the conclusions are not necessarily the personal conviction of this high school principal. The points touched upon represent areas of possible study.

Essential to our discussion, Integrating Educational Resources in Jesuit High Schools for Effective Student Development, is the basic notion of utilizing and directing all of the available forces at our command, personnel, existing educational facilities and students, for the most effective development of these students. In simpler form, the statement of the question might read: "What is the best way to get the most out of our students?" One section of Father Burlage's paper struck me as particularly significant and to the point: "Realistically to assess the needs of our students in the contemporary world and not rely on a mere traditional method which might have met some need very well, but may not meet the real needs of today."

Properly to assess the needs of today's students is difficult enough, but more is required, a realistic assessment and critical evaluation of this "traditional method" of the schools of the Society in the United States. Our keynoter poses the question of TRADITION, and here we must study both matter taught as well as the external method or manner. The first phase of such a study would involve CURRICULUM, and this is an item

noted by Father Sheahan last year at Atlantic City, and incorporated in the report of the JEA Secondary School Commission. The report reads, "challenge the Jesuit High School to improve its curriculum offerings . . ." An underlying supposition to this challenge is that the present curriculum offering needs some improvement. The second of last year's suggestions is that "we be in the vanguard of the various movements promoting curriculum enrichment," and this likewise takes for granted that changes are needed. The third section of last year's report follows in this same pattern but becomes more specific, "to put modern foreign language on an equal footing with the ancient languages." The tenor of these remarks, all possible approaches for improvement, indicate that improvement is needed and change would be welcomed and be an advantage. If such change is indicated, there are two possible avenues of approach: one toward greater modernization and innovation; the other, a return to a program which historically is even more traditional than that in current vogue in most of our Jesuit high schools. The tendency in the past two decades has been to gradual and slow change, following the examples of other schools and other systems. Father Burlage remarks, "Our education has not been either markedly original, or notably fruitful, using this term in the contemporary scientist's sense of generating novel, stimulating, and productive techniques in the field. Our general tendency has been simply to accept or to follow various curricular and institutional trends (usually a little more slowly, for a variety of reasons, than our non-Catholic counterparts) manifested by other American schools and colleges to changing social conditions."

The possibility presents itself of continuing this trend in curricular growth, of letting others do the experimentation and following slowly in their wakes, learning from their errors and successes; or stepping out boldly on our own by revising our curriculum to fit the needs of a modern day. Some of the suggested changes would envision a four-year Modern Language program, extended study in the field of Social Studies, a wider and more extensive study of the physical sciences. A third possibility likewise presents itself to our consideration. Our present curriculum might be considered as one which is not traditional at all, at least in the light of the history of Jesuit secondary schools even in this country. We can view the changes of the past four or five decades as too much of a concession to modernity and to innovation. There is something in the present-day situation which resembles the circumstances of the early part of this century. I refer to the time when our high schools were part of the Jesuit "College" and students stepped up to the college level in the same physical plant, with very little sudden change between college and high

school, when our students entered a Jesuit high school to continue on in the same institution until they received their Bachelor's degree, when the same teachers were part of the college and high school faculty.

Although there are many differences, there is a similarity today. Most of our students are college preparatory. Terminal studies are a minority, at least in ability. Our concern might very well be today fully to develop the intellectual abilities of the "college Prep" students, to supply a strong series of required courses which would stress the broad and general development of basic intellectual talents and leave the specialization to college, or even further, to graduate schools. In such a system, as was current years ago, electives would be few or missing. A strong liberal arts program with emphasis on literature, classical as well as modern, a strong course program in mathematics and the basic physical sciences would be in keeping with a tradition which was so successful in the past, and which fitted the student for a difficult college program, especially in our own colleges. This would be envisioned as a strong and difficult program, for the hardy soul who is capable of superior college work and eager for it, and one which is prescribed by school authorities, an obviously rigorous and narrow program which looks ahead to college and postgraduate work. In such a case, the only concession to modernity, at least in matter taught, would be the experience learned from other campuses that we can demand much more from our students and expect more and greater results.

Our assessment of curriculum must include method and manner as well. Innovation in externals, if this includes improvement, is always a step forward. Taking advantage of technological advances is part of the economy and wisdom of pedagogy. In this area, we might well question whether we have made sufficient use of modern means which would assist the personnel and the Jesuit institution to get the most out of our students.

This area likewise received a passing mention last year, "to investigate programmed instruction, educational TV and other modern teaching aids." To this I would add Team Teaching and the Electronic Classroom. School systems, smaller and less experienced, less well equipped in manpower than our own have made important experiments with these modern improvements. The eventual goal of these methods is to make greater or maximum use of available resources, of making more available our best teachers to more of our students, and more frequently. This precisely is one of the major problems in Jesuit secondary schools and investigation and experimentation with such methods seems like a logical possibility. Team Teaching opens the possibility of our best and most

experienced teachers reaching four or five times as many students. In certain areas of instruction, like mathematics, the sciences and languages, where it is becoming more difficult to place excellent teachers and to keep experienced teachers, this becomes a decided advantage. A second advantage is present. The younger, or journeyman teacher, in some sense becomes the pupil of the experienced teacher. The direction, at least in particular areas, of younger teachers becomes much more the responsibility of master teachers, and not only relieves the Principal of a difficult task, but presents a means of in-service training in the teacher's subject area. A third advantage will arise. Since this Team Teaching envisions the use of undergraduate students, cadet teachers, a possible pool of manpower of future teachers becomes available for the school.

Programmed Instruction has some of the above mentioned advantages, but has a particular value for schools, as are most of ours, which are totally homogeneously grouped. In an ideal situation, a single teacher with a proper program has the effect of three teachers, teaching each at a different level. A serious problem arises here. Such formal "programs" must be developed precisely for our Jesuit course of studies. True, there are some framed programs which we can borrow; but we should consider training experts at least in the individual province, who would become adept and experienced in building our own programs which would fit our own curriculum and syllabi.

Perhaps other modern methods speak for themselves, but I'd like to add a suggestion in the field of Educational, closed-circuit television. A significant problem with Educational T.V. is the initial cost and the required technical manpower, and the expense thereof of maintaining such a studio. An ideal solution, especially in an area where a number of Jesuit high schools are grouped closely geographically, near a Jesuit college and university, would be a Jesuit closed-circuit T.V. station operated by the School of Communication Arts of the university with the close cooperation of the Jesuit secondary school, their staff and with their financial support. Quite obviously the advantages would be enormous. Each school in a sense would have available the master teachers of the other schools. One of the major requirements for the use of many of these modern methods, at least as expressed by public school systems which have so experimented, is close cooperation of the faculty, an intimate knowledge of the student and of his problems, and a vital interest in the student. School superintendents have found these difficult to obtain; but where else could we hope to have all of these qualities than in our own schools and among our own staff members?

Advances in other areas have often left us far behind. The teacher

himself is another area of study. In-service development is another serious problem of our Educational Resources. The needs of today in this matter are met in a number of fashions, allotments of money and of time for the continuing education of teachers, merit pay and greater increments for study beyond the degrees, of sabbatical years to increase the potential of our teachers, of practical incentives for publishing. Consideration for the improvement of our staff, both Jesuit and laymen, is in order. The freedom of a summer for study, travel and writing is an important item and in recent years has been a step in the right direction. We might further investigate, however, the possibility of an entire year as a sabbatical for the proper leisure to think, study, and to write.

Exchange of personnel, the sharing of Jesuit and lay teachers, among our Jesuit high schools, within the same city or within the province or even among provinces is a practice worthy of thought. There is some doubt whether we have exploited fully the cooperation between college and high school staff. College level courses taught in the high school by members of the college departments have already made for more effective student development. They enhance the Jesuit high school and bring new prestige to the Jesuit college, at least in the eyes of high school faculty, students, and their parents. This would make far easier and more successful our attempts to direct our students to Catholic and to Jesuit colleges.

A further need of today might well be met by shortening our traditional high school course of four years—something else that is really not so traditional as we might think. There are many problems in arranging the practice of early admissions to college; but a possible solution can be arrived at by a more extensive use of our existing facilities. Instead of the common practice of remedial summer schools only, there is the possibility of using the summer time and school facilities for enrichment and advanced courses. Courses taught by faculty members from local Jesuit and other Catholic colleges, or even from non-Catholic colleges, might well make a three-year secondary school course a possibility at least for our gifted students.

And lastly to a final point, to a more effective use of our personnel and their abilities. Some consideration could be given to using our lay teachers in fields that have been reserved commonly for Jesuit priests. Even now some provinces are doing remote studies in the field of guidance for the more effective use of the time and energies and abilities of Jesuit guidance officers. Properly trained laymen could easily be used for vocational counselling, for social and emotional and scholastic guidance, in testing programs, which would leave the Jesuit priest free for more effi-

cient work in spiritual and intellectual guidance. I do not think we have fully explored the use of our lay staff in other fields. The fields of school discipline and of school plant maintenance can be pictured in charge of a layman, once again relieving and releasing a Jesuit priest for work which might demand the presence and effectiveness of a priest educated in the Jesuit tradition and system.

The areas mentioned in this paper, the challenges and suggestions, are hardly novel and have been entertained by most or even all present this evening. I present them merely as avenues of approach or discussion. I would shrink from the task of having to put them all into operation in a school. However, their consideration should be viewed in the light of another of the principles noted by Father Burlage that we must "realistically assess the nature and limitations of our resources, applying to their disposition the principle of maximum utility in view of the finality and situation previously established."

FAMILY'S RIGHT

The family holds directly from the Creator the mission and hence the right to educate the offspring, a right inalienable because inseparably joined to a strict obligation, a right anterior to any right whatever of civil society and of the state, and therefore inviolable on the part of any power on earth.

—Pope Pius XI: "Divinus Illius Magistri"

Our problem now is the dissolution of a nightmare that never visited Descartes—the horrid vision of man, master of nature, but not of himself, the possessor of nature who has lost its own identity.

—John Courtney Murray, *We Hold These Truths*

The University Comments . . .

THOMAS L. O'BRIEN, S.J.

Education will not be truly Catholic unless the whole of it, in the manner of understanding History, Literature, Technical Arts, Economics, be imparted *simultaneously* with both knowledge and faith.

Janssens, 1960, *On the Educational Apostolate*

Historians might well call our day the era of ecumenism. Unitive movements are melting age-old walls of separatism on every level of human concern. Ecumenical Protestantism astounds the hackneyed prejudices of only 15 years ago. Ecumenism is moving strongly through Catholic ranks. Union in Europe has washed away prejudices of a thousand years. The United Nations, the Alliance for Progress, the Organization of American States, the growing cooperation within our own society between management and labor, between business and education, between politics and the other social institutions, all these breathe strongly of union.

And the leader of these world-wide movements must, above all, be trained in intellectual ecumenism. He must, in short, be an expert in integration.

Now, the assumption made by Father Burlage that Jesuit education was historically conceived merely to imitate the disintegrating separatism of secular schools, while it may be true of the past, proves nothing of the future; except, perhaps, the frightening inefficacy of the present American educational machine to meet the emergent world. Even if this historical analysis is true, that fact does not raise an historical practice to the level of a principle.

The fourth part of the Constitutions, the Spiritual Exercises, and the Ratio of 1599 all place constant emphasis on the flexibility inherent in the growth potential of every human being in different times and different places. In very fact, the unique genius of Ignatius was, it seems to me, the ability to analyse coldly and objectively a given social climate, and to produce an instrument for God's glory uniquely fitted to that climate.

Hence, the problem of integration in today's education must be viewed in light of today's climate; must be examined in light of such questions as: What constitutes personal leadership in a world increasingly fragmented by scientific analysis? What is the intrinsic relation between central dogmas of our faith and our view of total reality translated into our

educational functions? What is our responsibility to establish educational patterns for others to follow? Granting that secularism in intellectual matters (Cartesian and Kantian separatism) is eating away the inner vitality of modern American moral structure, what is our responsibility in re-introducing the unitive Catholic vision of created reality into the center of the decision-making world?

1. What is demanded from personal Christian leadership in this world, fragmented by personal, social, economic, and international divisions? It is precisely the ability to integrate. Moral life has been divided from the business and political life. How does the Christian leader integrate them? Science has been divided off from philosophy and theology. How does the Christian leader get them back together? Metaphysics has been divided away from ethics and epistemology. How does the Christian leader get them back together? Faith has been separated from basic human concerns. How does the man of faith get them back together?

If we persist in perpetrating the divisive disciplines of a fragmented, departmental system of education solely because that is what the secularist world has found effective, then we should drop all pretenses of developing responsible Christian leaders. Then, it seems to me, the wise thing to do would be to close all our colleges and universities, and release our Jesuit personnel for specific religious services as adjunct to secular schools with their immensely more proficient plants, equipment, and secular scholarship.

2. How is our central dogma related to today's reality? The central dogma of Christianity is Christ, the Incarnate word, the Mind of God made flesh in a real, changing, physical universe. This Christ, as St. Paul has repeatedly said, came to unify, to reconcile opposites: "For all things are yours," he says; "whether . . . the world, or life, or death; or things present, or things to come—all are yours, and you are Christ's, and Christ is God's." (1 Cor. 3:22)

Now, if we really believe that Christ, the Logos, is extended into history and into geography, then we must conclude that all reality, created and Divine, is in some intrinsic fashion brought into union with God through the Logos.

If the end of our education is, as St. Ignatius says in his fourth part of the Constitutions, "to aid its own members and their fellow men to attain the ultimate end for which they were created," and if this ultimate end is the Beatific Vision, then certainly we are constrained by our very commitment to the centrality of Christ, to seek integration in our education. If we believe that there is projected into time and space the Mystical Body of Christ, then can we escape the conclusion that the Mystical Mind

of Christ must keep pace? And the Mind of Christ is the mind of unity, not of fragmentation.

3. Are we responsible for establishing educational patterns for the secular schools to follow, or are we merely to ape them? St. Ignatius apparently thought we had that responsibility. Where the Sentences of Peter Lombard were universally prevalent, he prescribed St. Thomas as text in theology. Where the Renaissance humanists had limited philosophy to some Greek and Latin ethicists and a smattering of natural philosophy, he introduced the texts of Aristotle, with emphasis on his metaphysics (Ganss, *St. Ignatius' Idea of a University*, p. 159). Both of these moves were revolutionary—both established patterns.

An eminent linguist, head of the Stanford University Language School, once asked me: "When are you Catholics ever going to get the courage of your faith?" I requested elaboration. He went on "You Catholics have a free dowry, the very unity which we outsiders are trying so hard and so futilely to get on our own." I could not answer him.

4. In a world dominated by ultimate skepticism, what responsibility do we have to strive through professional excellence to re-introduce Christian directionalism into the halls of the world's decisions?

Mr. William Sullivan, assistant to the Director of the F.B.I. in charge of anti-subversive activities, told me personally that in his mind the greatest single source of danger to the internal well-being of our country was the complete despair of certitude in our leading halls of learning. He then asked me why Catholic colleges were failing to counteract this disease. Without certitude, there is no freedom; and without freedom, there can be no free society. If this unique emodiment of human political freedom in the United States is truly providential, and just as truly unique, then our education in this context of ultimate contests for the human soul should be directed most dynamically to the professionally excellent propagation of the idea that certitude can be achieved in a searching and a changing world. But this certitude ultimately rests on an integration between faith and reason, and between reason and science, and between all these and the arts. Science by itself cannot reach certitude; reason by itself cannot long remain certain in its search for totality. It is the inner fusion of all knowing functions, faith, reason, science and symbol that furnishes the constancy and the flexibility necessary for a vital certitude in a changing world.

I have had four years experience (after 18 years of planning) in concrete experimentation in integration. We have integrated laterally among the four "virtue-areas" of analytic thought, symbolic thought, historic

thought, and scientific thought. For instance, while the student is studying Greek thought, he is also studying Greek literature, art, and architecture, Greek history and, as much as possible, Greek mathematics. We have also integrated historically, on the conviction that the unfolding of the human mind in history is under providential guidance, and hence the only valid insight into the great visions of the past is from the point of view of the seer, not from ours. It is impossible, in short, to appreciate Plato without appreciating Parmenides and Heraclites; impossible to evaluate Aristotle, without going to him from Plato; impossible to understand the New Testament without going to it from the Old Testament and from the bankrupt Greco-Roman mind into which its lightning-flash of good news fell. To read St. Thomas from the 20th Century, without understanding the immense background which produced him, is to put impossible burdens on both St. Thomas and the student.

We have had our problems, chiefly the problem of getting our Honors students out of the passive posture developed during their twelve years of listening and repeating pre-arranged answers, and into the active, creative attitude of discovery, of intrinsic growth through creative understanding. There are other problems; a certain isolation from the rest of the students; a certain social penalty through lack of time to engage in the innumerable social activities of campus life, a certain juvenile snobishness that can only be cured by experience in ignorance. But none of these problems in any way threatens to outweigh the immense advantages of maturity, of discovery, of writing, reading, and listening capabilities developed in the program. And all of these problems, we have proven, are either avoidable or curable.

I would agree, therefore, with Father Burlage, that our function is to prepare our students for the world they are to live in and influence. But I disagree with him that we can best do this by imitating the disintegration of secularist colleges; quite the contrary.

I agree with him that we should coldly and impassively evaluate our current assets and make thoughtful, careful adjustments leading more directly toward our end. I would agree that we face the problem of quality, and hence should limit our intake of students to achieve that quality. I agree that our effectiveness would be greatly enhanced if we concentrated in those fields of education more natively Jesuit, and save our resources from being wasted in thinly spread efforts to imitate what can be much better accomplished by wealthy secular institutions.

All this I accept, and gratefully. But I could not disagree more than I do with his assertion that our current function is to accept passively the

status quo of a disintegrated society, and further that disintegration by imitating those very institutions and their patterns which are largely, if not totally, responsible for that disintegration.

In light of all this I would venture to give answers to the admirable questions provided for our pre-convention consideration:

1. It is not enough to "rely on the student" to achieve his own integration, since integration is the fruit of wisdom, the most difficult and subtle of the intellectual virtues.
2. There is no real conflict between the "integrity of the subject matter" and the "development of the student"—each rather contributes to each.
3. The "historical approach" is the more effective pedagogy, since the individual human mind develops analogously with the gradually developing "historical mind" from the less to the more complex.
4. There need be no conflict between faculty "stated commitments" and "objectivity in instructing," since the human corporate insight, developing under Divine Providence, provides at one and the same time for faculty "commitment" and "objectivity."

REPLY TO THE COMMENT OF FATHER O'BRIEN

I should like to make just two points. First of all, I feel that Father O'Brien does not so much disagree with what I said (or intended to say—and I make no appeal here to a distinction between what I actually said and the summary text I submitted to him) as with his own interpretation of what I said. I do not recall advocating "passive acceptance" of departmentalized education, as if we were required to submit, without will of our own, to every development which the general American educational scene exhibits. I would suggest that there can be such a thing as "active acceptance" and that it is quite possible for us to recognize the genuine and actual utility of educational procedures originating outside our own (Jesuit) tradition—although within the American tradition which I would claim as equally our own. Indeed, I would go farther and say that in the situation which confronts us where certainly the vast majority of Catholic students of all degrees of ability want and need an "American" education we have no real choice except to give it to them. Once more I am not advocating a spirit of weary resignation to the inevitable: I am suggesting that we seek for and find the real values in the accepted patterns of American education, improve them, and make the best possible use of them for our Jesuit purpose.

I would urge also a further point: as I conceive it "integration" does

not imply only unity; it insists also upon difference. Activities can be "integrated" only in terms of achieving an harmonious relationship between a *variety* of elements, not by reducing this variety to a simplist or even monist unity. I quite agree that "in Christ opposites are *reconciled* . . ." but they remain in some sense truly opposite. If I may quote an authority—no longer so popular, perhaps, as he once was—it is quite true that it is the objective of Christianity to make the lion and the lamb lie down together. But the lion must remain a lion; the lamb a lamb. To achieve the objective *by turning the lion into a lamb*—this is mere vulgar imperialism on the part of the lamb.

I consider it, therefore, of fundamental importance that the proper and proximate specifying finality of various disciplines and activities be preserved and respected. If I am urged to explain further how this difference and variety are to be preserved, I say this: first of all we must distinguish between "integration-in-the-person" which is what we aim at achieving in our students, and which certainly involves the Christ-centeredness and "Christ-engaged-ness" of his entire life. This objective, insofar as it is attained by formal education at all, is achieved not by this or that course, not even by the academic curriculum as a whole, but by the total educational experience in the classroom and out of it. "Integration-in-the-curriculum" is something else, and obviously different disciplines contribute to it differently. In my own view, the achievement of such integration is directly the responsibility of the departments of theology and philosophy, which attain a position of sufficient universality of view to permit an understanding of the relations and inter-connections of the variety of human activities; as a discipline declines from this universality, so also does it have a lesser "integrating" function, and some of them—the physical sciences, for instance—have (quite properly) so narrow a specification that all we can explicitly ask of them is an "openness" to the integrating understanding of philosophy and theology. Even of philosophy and theology we must not demand too much: it is not their immediate purpose to make "good Christians," but to communicate and stimulate intellectual and rational understanding of the real. The development of "the whole man" (in Christ) is the task of the whole (Christian) university.

The Jesuit Impact on American Higher Education as Seen by a Catholic Co-Worker

RIGHT REVEREND MONSIGNOR WILLIAM J. McDONALD

My presence here in this distinguished company permits me to discharge a debt of gratitude. I wish to acknowledge, first of all, the many kindnesses shown me by members of the Society of Jesus in this country and abroad. As Rector of the Catholic University of America I should like also to express gratitude for the services of the Jesuit members of our faculty and to pay tribute to the Jesuit graduate students on our campus, a numerous, industrious and unobtrusive group, many of whom display an interest in our University quite beyond the call of duty. In this way we have first-hand evidence of the widespread University training program for your students which has been in operation for quite some time and which has resulted in a remarkable increase in the educational resources of the Society in the United States. As Editor-in-Chief of *The New Catholic Encyclopedia*, I am keenly appreciative of the cooperation shown by the Fathers Provincial and so many of your outstanding scholars who are working with us on that monumental project. Moreover, as President of the Federation of Catholic Universities I have been immensely supported by the friendly collaboration of all the great Jesuit universities throughout the world. In view of such a record of good will, it would be difficult to refuse an invitation to speak on a topic for which my chief credential is that you have asked me to do so.

It is not my intention to give an abstract presentation of educational theory or methods; still less to make sweeping condemnations of Catholic education in any of its phases. We can scarcely claim to be products of any kind of Christian training unless our statements are in some way characterized by prudence, humility and charity, unless we manifest something of the integration of the intellectual with the moral and theological virtues. As you are well aware, the intellectual virtues include more than knowledge just as rationality includes more than the intellectual faculty. The most refined distillation of the human mind is wisdom which was the quest of the great thinkers throughout the ages.

All this is not directly related to our subject, but it has much to do with

the foundations which underlie all true education, "the proper and immediate aim (of which) is to form Christ in the soul of the baptized person" (Pope Pius XI, *Divini Illius Magistri*). The purpose of true Christian education, therefore, is to offset, as far as possible, the effects of original sin. These effects are not only in the intellectual, but also in the ethical and religious domain. Our teaching must be shot through with a spiritual quality that pervades, permeates, and penetrates all that we do. Catholic education differs even on its intellectual side because we have a command to love God with our whole mind. This power of intellectual affection is frequently forgotten. Besides the love of wisdom there is also a wisdom of love. It is not just that in the classroom we sometimes talk about God, but that we must be constantly affirming, even though not always explicitly, the primacy of the spiritual. Without drawing any moral lessons it is still possible, even in the imparting of subjects which do not call for a direct reference to the Divine, to stamp our teaching with the hallmark of our faith.

Against this general background we can now set down some facts which affect all of us, including the Society. I think we can agree that:

1. Our efforts in formal education are in the largest sense missionary, that is looking ultimately to the conversion of our country. "Accordingly," wrote Pope Pius XI in *Divini Illius Magistri*, "the Church promotes literature and the arts and sciences insofar as they are useful to Christian education and to her general purpose of the salvation of souls."
2. The spreading of the gospel has always involved the question of degree of adaption, of how far we should go in making concessions to the alien environment which is the object of our missionary effort.
3. Differences on this question reach back to St. Paul and the Fathers of the Church and are still with us.
4. All of us still unconsciously reflect in our actions and reactions the stresses of the Reformation struggle; and the Society called into being to check the Reformation, and which proved to be the chief instrument in checking it, is especially stamped by that experience.

We now move from what I assume will be generally accepted by all of us to items which are more or less debatable.

1. The tendency within and outside the Society to accept too many features of the culture which is the immediate object of our missionary effort.
2. Differences of approach to contemporary America, as reflected in divergent viewpoints:
 - a. Those interested in developing *Catholic Americanism* which, in practice, means an attempt to "baptize" contemporary pragmatism and secularism.

- b. Those who tend to put specific aims and goals over and above those of Catholicism at large.
 - c. Those who are interested in the improvement and development of *American Catholicism* (as distinct from Catholic Americanism). These differences project themselves upon the educational scene with the result that the most vocal if not most numerous, group seems to dominate the educational policy-making process in some institutions of higher learning.
3. The influence of certain policies concerning administration and faculty:
 - a. The tendency to remove *potentially* good administrators at too early a stage from their scholarly career, and to have them concentrate on administration sometimes without sufficient understanding of higher educational policy and problems.
 - b. The tendency to fill administrative and teaching positions indiscriminately.
 4. The policy sometimes expressed of trying to make a certain institution a Catholic "Harvard" is an example of secularizing tendencies. Other examples may be cited:
 - a. Cooperation with secular institutions at any price or the belief that only a secular approach will lead to this desired cooperation.
 - b. The unfortunate influence of this approach on younger Catholic lay people especially at a time when the Church is expecting them to play an even larger role in her apostolic mission. In this respect we might all ask ourselves: How many of our graduates go out with a real sense of commitment to the standards of Christ.
 - c. Lack of understanding that American Catholicism has a definite and specific contribution to make to American life and of the impossibility of achieving this goal by sheer imitation of the secularizing tendencies of our time. Imitation does not mean leadership. Within the field of Catholic education the Society has a unique opportunity to lead the way in bringing about a better articulation between high school, college and university, since it alone possesses such a great network of educational institutions at all of these levels.
 5. The seduction of bigness or what Arnold Toynbee called "colossality." This manifests itself in two ways:
 - a. Within a university when it is allowed to expand indiscriminately and become a sort of super business concern or "service station," certain programs may be attractive money-wise and may even bring in large grants and contracts at the same time that they get us off the track as far as our real objectives are concerned. Studies have shown that many American institutions of higher learning leave little or no influence, indeed sometimes have an adverse effect, on the student as regards his standards of behavior, his social and ethical judgments, and his reli-

gious beliefs. Certainly this should not be true of Catholic colleges and universities. Rather such a Catholic-mindedness should be fostered amongst graduates that for the rest of their lives they would eagerly associate themselves with parochial and diocesan activities. The parish is the basic cell of the Mystical Body and, therefore, our failure in this respect would mean a great loss of opportunity for service to the Church and to our country.

- b. The tendency to multiply educational institutions too rapidly and to link up with non-Catholic institutions even in certain sensitive fields. This does not mean that I am opposed to the small college because it often serves a definite need and represents the counterpart of private enterprise in education. Nor am I against cooperation under proper conditions. Indeed, as John Stuart Mill said, "there is no more accurate test of the progress of civilization than the progress of the power of cooperation." Where feasible there should, I believe, be even closer cooperation between Jesuit and other Catholic institutions and organizations. This will be more and more needed in certain areas as we become increasingly conscious of the enormous task with which our whole Catholic system of education is faced in the future. In that future, the Jesuit educational system, with a university and liberal arts tradition dating back to the days of its founder, will be called upon to play an ever more important role in Catholic higher education. The unique resources and the disciplined zeal of the Society must contribute the maximum to the attainment of the common goal which the Church has given to all of us, namely, the most effective development of those fellow Catholics committed to our care. This will not be done by shouting or waving banners, *non in commotione Deus*. If any of us should be tempted to make extravagant claims or to speak in terms of educational perfection we would do well to read again that striking passage in Cardinal Newman's *Idea of a University*:

" . . . One only among the sons of men has carried out a perfect work, and satisfied and exhausted the mission on which He came. One alone has with His last breath said, 'Consummatum est.' But all who set about their duties in faith and hope and love, with a resolute heart and a devoted will, are able, weak though they be, to do what, though incomplete, is imperishable. Even their failures become successes, as being necessary steps in a course, and as terms (so to say) in a long series, which will at length fulfill the object which they propose. And they will unite themselves in spirit, in their humble degree, with those real heroes of Holy Writ and ecclesiastical history, Moses, Elias, and David, Basil, Athanasius and Chrysostom, Gregory the Seventh, St. Thomas of Canterbury, and many others, who did most when they fancied themselves least prosperous, and died without being permitted to see the fruit of their labors."

Jesuit Schools of the World: 1961

WILLIAM J. MEHOK, S.J.

Since the last of this series appeared,¹ attention is directed to two other articles which bridge the gap and are presupposed here. One summarizes trends in Jesuit growth viewed geographically.² The other is an attempt to answer the question: "What do Jesuits do?"³ The present survey will not duplicate any of its predecessors exactly; nevertheless, subtotals and totals are comparable for purposes of analysis and comparison.

In broadest outline, this study purports to do three things. In the first place, it will give as accurate as possible, though limited, a picture of present-day Jesuit world educational activity. Secondly, it proposes to analyse, criticize, and draw some conclusions from these data; and, finally, presupposing this accomplished, it will attempt to discover and explain any time trends.

In each of the foregoing processes the following over-all consideration should be borne in mind. Our task is a two-fold one. We are in possession of a mass of unorganized data which we assume to mirror reality. From these data we attempt to extract details and reconstruct a picture of this twice-removed reality. To anticipate our story, it is the first of these steps, from reality to paper, that is responsible for most of the erratic and unpredictable results which may ensue. The transit from paper to our image of reality can be made with as great precision as time and availability of data allow. We have chosen a degree of precision commensurate with the reliability of the data.

The process is analogous to star watching. The stars are there all the time and just as bright, but if the skies are hazy or cloudy, we will do just as well using an inexpensive telescope and wait till they clear up to use the big reflectors.

I. THE CURRENT PICTURE

In the year beginning 1961, 77 (80 less Bohemia, Romenica, and Slovakia) provinces (V.P.I.'s, V.P.D.'s, Independent Missions) listed under

¹ Mehok, W. J., S.J., "Jesuit Schools of the World," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, Vol. XXIII, No. 2 (Oct. 1960), pp. 93-107.

² Mehok, W. J., S.J., "Geographic Status and Trend of the Society: 1957-60," *Woodstock Letters*, Vol. 90, No. 3 (July 1961), pp. 238-245.

³ Mehok, W. J., S.J., "What Do Jesuits Do?," *Social Compass*, Vol. VIII, No. 6 (1961), pp. 567-574.

the heading, "Ordo Regiminis Superiorum," at the end of their province catalogues, 1,211 superiors. For reasons explained elsewhere, they omitted 21, which we now add. Likewise, because some of these are not superiors in the true sense, nor do we count multiple superiors in the same houses, we subtract 39, thereby leaving a net total of 1,193 local superiors who have under their jurisdiction nearly all Jesuits in the world.⁴ Of these, 315 superiors do not have any schools in their care, while the remaining 878 have at least one school. These we identify as educational institutions or, technically, clusters.

Table 1 shows how many institutions comprise how many schools, at what levels, to enroll what categories of students, and who owns the physical plant of these schools which are administered by Jesuits. Thus, for example, 680 superiors (clusters) have schools which enroll only non-Jesuits; 121 have schools which enroll only Jesuits and 77 with schools for both Jesuits and non-Jesuits. Each of these is further subdivided according to ownership of constituent schools.

Line 6 of column (2) is a good example since these 8 superiors have schools for all possible combinations. Each has at least one of 15 (in this case only elementary) schools which the Society does not own. In addition, these same 8 superiors have 9 secondary schools and 38 higher schools for non-Jesuits, all owned by the Order, and each has at least one of the 10 schools for the formation of Jesuits. In all, they have 57 Jesuit-owned schools and 15 not owned by the Society. Total: 72 schools. This table points to the wide diversity of combinations that these schools take and the difficulty encountered in trying to generalize on the "typical Jesuit school."

Table 2 carries this analysis further, with emphasis on category of students and level of instruction. Since most questions concern institutions of higher learning for non-clerical students, we have divided these according to our own and the best knowledge and judgment of others. In general, the higher level prevails over the lower, and, among higher schools for lay students, a true University prevails over all others, and so on in the order that these are listed.

Let us take row E) column (8) as an example. This institution (rector) has schools for the following levels and types of students: a) higher institute, not a university or liberal arts college, for lay students, b) scholasticate, house of formation or academic residence for Jesuits in formation, c) major seminary or residence for diocesan or other non-

⁴ A total of 1,175 Jesuits belong to Provincials' Curias or live in the territory of the three provinces which were excluded and are therefore not included under the 1,193 local superiors.

Jesuit clerical students and, d) elementary and/or secondary school(s) for lay students.

The total rows, I) to L), supply most frequently demanded summaries. There are 135 institutions of higher education for lay students, 49 of which enroll nobody else, 63 which have only elementary and/or secondary schools attached, and the remaining 23 embrace Jesuit houses of formation. This last figure is further divided as follows: 10 with no other school added, 11 with elementary and/or secondary schools and 2 with faculties for diocesan students which also have elementary/secondary schools.

There are similar break-downs for lay elementary and/or secondary institutions, diocesan/other non-Jesuit clerical institutions, and, finally, institutions for the formation of Jesuits. It is obvious that these classes are not mutually exclusive. The device is used to satisfy such as want the information in this form.

Table 3 breaks down the 878 institutions into their constituent schools, giving world figures for enrollment and number of teachers. It is the counterpart of Table 3 in the 1959 survey.

Table 4 is a condensed version of its (1959) predecessor's tables 4 to 9, with comparable subtotals and totals only. It is to be noted that a special column is not given for the U.S.A. (corresponding to Table 5-A, 1959) and that Oceania (Table 9, 1959) is joined to Asia this year.

Table 5 follows a procedure analogous to tables 4 to 9 of 1959 except that only schools (ESU's), and not enrollment nor teachers are enumerated. This is quite useful for quick estimating, since averages for students and teachers per certain type of school have not changed much, though, in some cases, the number of schools has changed considerably.

Finally, Table 6 indicates a few temporal trends. Since certain details are lacking for the year beginning 1957, the base year has been fixed at 1958 and all indexes are computed relative to that year. The index is useful since it reduces disparate figures and even characteristics to a comparable measure. To take the most obvious example, total number of Jesuits in the entire Society has been increasing at the rate of about 1 per cent a year (column 1). One would expect the other characteristics to proceed at a comparable rate. Later we shall analyze the discrepancies and inconsistencies.

This completes the description of the total Jesuit endeavor throughout the world for the school year beginning before 1961. We now turn to an analysis and criticism of this picture. Before doing so, however, it is of interest to point out a few facts revealed by the original data but which are not contained in the tables published here. Three countries, U.S.A.,

Spain, and India, account for about one-third to one-half of all Jesuit education.⁵

II. ANALYSIS AND CRITICISM

Let us for the moment assume that in the collection, presentation, analysis and reporting of the aforementioned data, ideal conditions prevailed. Even so, one could expect variation from year to year with respect to the characteristics here studied. This is known as chance or random difference, and measures are available for determining its presence and extent, beyond which change must be attributed to factors other than chance.

Such comparisons and tests were made between Table 1 (1961) and Table 1 (1959). The distribution 680, 121, 77 (1961) column (1) does not differ significantly from 658, 112, 73 (1959) column (1); that is, proportion of clusters according to category of students enrolled.

Neither is there a significant difference between these two years with reference to column (11), which is the same comparison but for schools (ESU's) (column 10, 1959).

When one compares the distribution of schools according to level (2,471, 817, 482, 289 Total 4,059 for 1961) a significant difference is observed (Chi-square P at 5% level). On further analysis, this was traced not to Jesuit-owned schools (359, 626, 449, 289 = 1,723) but to non-Jesuit owned schools (2,112, 191, 33, 0 = 2,336), where the difference is highly significant (Chi-square, P less than .001).

This narrows down to Africa, where a significant difference, at the 5% level, exists between elementary and non-elementary schools (835, 91 = 926, Table 5, column (2) 1961) compared with the corresponding proportional distribution for 1959.⁶ On examination of the data for Africa, the reason for the difference seems to be explainable thus. What we are measuring is the difference in the balance between elementary and non-elementary schools, and Africa shows an unexplained decline in proportion of secondary schools from 12% in 1959 to 10% in 1961. This appears to be caused by the fact that many schools were misclassified at the earlier date owing to a lack of clear understanding as to their

⁵ The proportion of the following characteristics for these three countries to the entire Society is: number of educational institutions—35%; total number of schools—44%; number of Jesuit-owned schools—40%; total number of Jesuits who teach and/or administer—45%; total number of Jesuits of all grades and in all occupations living in these three countries—41%. Average of percentages—41%.

⁶ These comparisons were made, and can be readily verified, by the use of Moesteller-Tukey binomial probability paper. This is explained in Wallis, W. A. and H. V. Roberts, *Statistics: A New Approach*, Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1956, pp. 604-616, to mention a readily available source.

nature. Likewise, political unrest during the interval closed more secondary than primary non-Jesuit owned schools.

Apart from Africa, however, there seems to be the same relative balance between the various classes of institutions and schools today as in 1959. Concretely, excepting Africa, in so far as schools administered but not owned by the Society are concerned, Tables 1, 3 and level subtotals of Table 5 for 1961 have not shown significant departures from the equilibrium existing in 1959.

Let us for the present transmit until later whether or not the number of institutions and schools have increased in number at a rate greater than the number of Jesuits, and take up the consideration of enrollment and number of teachers.

First, with respect to enrollment, for valid reasons our approach is slightly different. One might pose the question thus: "Is there a significant increase (or decrease) in number of students *per school*, 1961 over 1959?" Briefly, the answer is, no; but an explanation is in order.

The analysis was set up thus. A random sample of 100 of the total 878 (11%) institutions in 1961 was drawn and the enrollment was compared with the corresponding 1959 figures. There was no evidence of a significant change in average per cluster between 1959 and 1961. Since the correlation between change in number of schools per cluster and enrollment is positive and significant, *a fortiori* there is no significant increase in average size of school (ESU). This is a reasonable conclusion. It is true that one can expect existing schools with time to increase in size; yet, newly created schools are much below average and tend to equalize the average.

This, however, does not mean that the averages are exactly the same for the two years. Where a continent or even the entire Society had few schools of a particular type (e.g., 286 students enrolled in 6 minor seminaries on the elementary level), a full count rather than an estimate was made. Likewise, there has been considerable rearrangement within levels. Thus, for example, there has been a decline in number of "Other" secondary schools. These are smaller on the average than "Standard" secondary schools, which have gained in number. Accordingly, the average size of "Secondary: Lay" schools has gone up (314 in 1959 to 329 in 1961).

Finally, where a more accurate estimating procedure was available, it was used. Thus, the U.S.A. issues accurate annual figures for many of its schools. These figures were used to the extent that they applied. Likewise, it is well known that Jesuits in formation correlate strongly with

number of scholastics. Since time trends in various geographic areas have not been uniform, the ratio of increase or decrease of scholastics for continents has been used to estimate number of Jesuits in formation. Spot checks were made on this assumption and it was discovered that the estimate and the full count came out about the same.

Much the same reasoning was used in estimating the number of teachers. Here, however, complicating factors enter which produce seemingly contradictory results. Thus, enrollment shows a steady, even exaggerated, increase, whereas the number of teachers sometimes shows a decline. Let us begin with Jesuit teachers and/or administrators.

In view of subsequent studies, the 1957 estimate can now be proved to be an overestimate. When this early survey was made, our only interest in Jesuits was whether they were teachers or students. Since then, a third group, "Other," has been studied.⁷ As the number of Jesuits is fixed, the overestimate in number of teachers/administrators is readily detected.

How was it possible for such a large difference to enter and be undetected? First, sampling error seems to have gone in the direction of overestimation. Then, as subsequent studies show, about 2.3% (1.5% to 3.5%) of Jesuits teaching were duplicates, that is, they lived in one house but came to a different house to teach a course or two.

In the early study, preoccupation was solely with Jesuits engaged in formal academic work. Hence, anyone, even if he contributed in only the smallest measure, was included although by subsequent standards his contribution would be considered not primary nor secondary but tertiary. These latter have been ignored in recent studies.

Finally, the definition of what is meant by a teacher/administrator was modified so as to exclude persons on the border line. Such exclusions number: secretaries to rector, dean, etc., of a college; assistant librarian of a school library; spiritual directors of any but students, whether these students be lay, diocesan or Jesuits; assistant treasurers; assistant ministers of schools; Jesuits whose secondary occupation is to teach religion in parochial schools unless it is evident that they are otherwise involved in its instruction or administration.

Briefly, Jesuits teaching most probably have been increasing at the same (or slightly greater) rate as the total membership of the Order, and the best estimate of their number is the most recent.

Estimates of non-Jesuit teachers/administrators indicate a similar anomaly and for much the same reason. Contributing more, however, is

⁷ Cf. *supra*, "What do Jesuits Do?"

the availability of more accurate original data provided by province catalogues. Not so many round numbers are in evidence and, I think, part-time lay teachers and custodial and maintenance staff are not being so readily included. These difficulties have not been solved on the local nor provincial levels, so there is small hope that it will be solved soon on the international level. Counting of lay teachers is the least satisfactory of the estimates, but it is the best that can be made until agreement is reached by the experts and their decision filters down to the ranks.

In conclusion, present estimates seem to be good, but, as we shall see, a state of equilibrium has not yet been reached. Maybe the next survey will answer this need.

III. TRENDS

Some statisticians equate time trend and index number artists with fortune tellers. The condition is not improved if the period considered is only three or four years. Nevertheless, index numbers are suggestive, and, in the absence of any better measures, answer in a general way many urgent questions. We turn, then, to Table 6. Column (1) tells us that total number of Jesuits is increasing at a net rate of about 1% a year. Other things being equal, we would expect that the various characteristics relating to education would progress at about the same rate. Subsequent inquiry tests this assumption.

The year 1957 can be ignored, first because comparable data for all characteristics are not available, and secondly, because it fell within a period of transition during which only Jesuit-owned schools were being reported with any degree of accuracy. Despite this, the trend in total number of institutions (column 2) does not differ significantly from the trend in Society's personnel. This is true even if we include 1957.⁸

The trend in total number of schools (column 3) differs significantly from the expected distribution based on growth of total Jesuit personnel. This is so not by reason of Jesuit owned schools, where there is no significant difference, but by reason of non-Jesuit owned schools where the difference in trends is highly significant.

Enrollment (column 4) differs significantly from expectation as does also total number of Jesuit teachers/administrators (column 5). Non-Jesuit teachers/administrators differ from expectation at the 2% level but not at the 1% level of confidence (column 6).

⁸ In general, all rectors, those with schools and those without, rule progressively smaller communities. The combined trend has been 100, 102, 106.

CONCLUSION

Viewing the total Jesuit educational picture, there is reason for optimism both methodologically and pedagogically. Although, through faults in reporting and change in point of view in summarizing, this report has not yet reached a point of equilibrium, still, time trends in recent years show that such balance is being approached.

Crude as our measures may be, they all point in the direction of expansion. Whether this is real or apparent remains to be seen. Nor is it our office to judge whether such expansion is a good thing or bad.

It is apparent from even the most casual observation that where there is healthy educational growth, there also the Society is prospering. Should the growth in education be really as rapid, relative to the Society's membership, as it appears to be, then there is danger in the nature of the education offered being changed. I do not say the change will be bad. That remains for others to weigh and decide.

What then is the distinguishing mark of the Christian school? Probably the most distinctive characteristic is the ordering of knowledge in an atmosphere wherein the spiritual and the supernatural are properly related in the hierarchy of values. The Catholic philosophy of education is based on the reality of the supernatural and its primacy in the total scheme of things. The values, goals and ideals of the natural order—important and worthy of pursuit as these may be—are subordinate in Catholic eyes to those of the supernatural order.

—N. G. McCluskey, S.J.

FOR VIGILANCE

This is a time for vigilance against the divorce of civic idealism from spiritual ideas—and a time for Christian education to number high among its objectives its unique part in helping prepare America to provide the moral leadership inevitably following upon and yet essential to her political power.

—Bishop John J. Wright of Pittsburgh

TABLE I. Distribution of 4,059 schools administered by 878 Jesuit local superiors throughout the world, arranged according to ownership of physical plant, level of instruction, category of students educated and various combinations. Year beginning 1961.

EDUCATE	Number of Clusters		OWN	STUDENTS EDUCATED						OWNERSHIP					
				Lay*			Jesuits			SJ	Mixed	Non-SJ	Total		
				Inf.	Sec.	Sub.	Sub.	Total							
									(3)					(4)	(5)
	(1)	(2)													
LAY*		462	SJ	299	488	273	1,060			
		136	NON	1,110	100	21	1,231	1,231			
	680		{ SJ	50	87	59	196	(196)	1,097	(901)			3,388
		82	{ NON	809	80	12	901			
JESUITS	121	121	SJ	183	183			183
LAY AND JESUITS		53	SJ	10	42	79	74	205			
		8	{ SJ	0	9	38	10	57	(57)	...	72	(15)			488
	77		{ NON	15	0	0	...	15			
		16	{ SJ	22	22	(22)	...	211	(189)			
			{ NON	178	11	0	...	189			
TOTAL		636	SJ	359	626	449	289	1,723	1,448			
		106	Both	(275)	...	1,380	(1,105)			4,059
	878	136	NON	2,112	191	33	2,336	1,231			
		878	TOTAL	2,471	817	482	289	4,059	(1,723)	(2,336)			4,059
	878			3,770			289			4,059					

* Includes diocesan and other non-Jesuit students.

TABLE 2. Distribution of 878 Jesuit educational institutions by level of instruction and types of students enrolled, using institutions of higher learning for lay students as a basis. School year beginning before January 1, 1961.

TYPE OF HIGHER INSTITUTION FOR LAY STUDENTS	LEVEL OF INSTRUCTION AND CATEGORY OF STUDENTS EDUCATED									
	LAY		DIOCESAN—OTHER			JESUITS				
	Higher (1)	Ele.-Sec. (2)	(3)	Ele.-Sec. (4)	(5)	Ele.-Sec. (6)	Diocesan—Other			TOTAL (9)
							Ele.-Sec. (7)	Ele.-Sec. (8)	Ele.-Sec. (9)	
A) NONE	0	532 ^a	22	14	121	40	10	4	743	
B) UNIVERSITY	7	10	3	4	..	1	25	
C) "UNIVERSITY"	5	10	1	16	
D) LIBERAL ARTS	16	27	1	1	45	
E) HIGHER INSTITUTE	4	11	1	3	..	1	20	
F) ACADEMIC RESIDENCE	15	4	2	1	22	
G) OTHER	2	1	2	2	7	
H) TOTAL	49	595	22 ^b	14 ^c	131 ^d	51 ^e	10 ^f	6 ^g	878	
I) LAY: Higher	49	63 ^h	10	11	..	2	135	
J) LAY: Elementary-Secondary	595	..	14	..	51	..	6	666	
K) DIOCESAN—OTHER	22	14	10	6	52	
L) JESUITS	131	51	10	6	198	

A) No higher institutions for lay students.

B) University in the true sense of a complex institution fully developed.

C) Designated a university, but, owing to lack of complexity or development, listed separately.

D) Liberal Arts colleges, Faculties of Philosophy and Letters, post-secondary minor seminaries.

E) Institutes, higher technical schools, higher teachers' colleges.

F) Higher academic residences; no instruction.

G) Other. Principally adult education.

NOTE: If institution has schools of different classes, order of precedence is that listed above. University precedes a liberal arts college, institute precedes an academic residence, etc.

^a 532 institutions do not have any schools offering higher instruction.

^b 22 diocesan seminaries or institutions for ecclesiastical students other than Jesuits but without any schools for lay students.

^c 14 institutions for diocesan—other students but having annexed schools for lay students on the primary or secondary but not higher levels.

^d 131 "Scholasticates" or houses of formation for Jesuits. 121 of these do not have schools for lay students, 10 have higher lay students.

^e 51 houses of formation; 40 have schools on the primary and secondary levels, 11 also have higher instruction for lay students.

^f 10 houses of formation for Jesuits with diocesan—other major seminary students attending.

^g 6 houses of formation for Jesuits; 4 having diocesan—other and lay elementary-secondary but not higher students; 2 having all categories and levels of students.

^h 63 institutions of higher learning for lay students which also have elementary-secondary schools attached.

TABLE 3. Number of students enrolled, number of Jesuit and non-Jesuit teachers and/or administrators in 4,059 schools administered by the Society of Jesus in the world, arranged according to level and type of education. School year beginning before January 1961.

LEVEL, TYPE OF STUDENTS	JESUIT OWNED SCHOOLS					NON-SJ OWNED SCHOOLS					TOTAL SCHOOLS				
	SCHOOLS		TEACH./ADMIN.			SCHOOLS		TEACH./ADMIN.			SCHOOLS		TEACH./ADMIN.		
	ESU (1)	Enroll (2)	SJ (3)	N-SJ (4)	3 ^a (5)	ESU (5)	Enroll (6)	SJ (7)	N-SJ (8)	0 ^b (9)	ESU (9)	Enroll (10)	SJ (11)	N-SJ (12)	3 ^a (13)
Minor Seminaries . . .	6	286 ^a	14 ^a	3 ^a	1	7 ^a	0 ^b	0 ^a	0 ^a	0 ^a	7	293 ^a	14 ^a	3 ^a	3 ^a
Other Non-Standard . .	28	9,224	35	229	5	668	4	21	33	9,892	33	9,892	39	250	250
Standard	325	115,203	548	3,362	2,106	390,541	749	9,026	2,431	505,744	1,297	505,744	1,297	12,388	12,388
ELEMENTARY: Lay . . .	359	124,713	597	3,594	2,112	391,216	753	9,047	2,471	515,929	1,350	515,929	1,350	12,641	12,641
Minor Seminaries . . .	110	7,031	419	70	6	335 ^a	22 ^a	12 ^a	12 ^a	7,366	441	7,366	441	82	82
Adult Education . . .	84	19,047	107	610	4	468 ^a	5 ^a	20 ^a	189	19,515	112	19,515	112	630	630
Technical, Professional .	55	11,499	179	576	49	3,774	45	189	104	15,273	224	15,273	224	765	765
Other	17	3,874	42	103	14	1,753	9	126	31	5,627	51	5,627	51	229	229
Standard	360	164,811	4,821	5,036	118	16,251	157	622	478	181,062	4,978	181,062	4,978	5,658	5,658
SECONDARY: Lay	626	206,262	5,568	6,395	191	2,2581	238	969	817	228,843	5,806	228,843	5,806	7,364	7,364
Minor Seminaries . . .	5	340	12	5	2	33 ^a	7 ^a	0 ^a	0 ^a	373	19	373	19	5	5
Adult Education . . .	37	13,235	49	803	37	13,235	49	13,235	49	803	803
Acad. Res., Other . . .	27	3,071	34	7	4	576 ^a	9 ^a	59 ^a	31	3,647	43	3,647	43	66	66
Institutes	27	4,687	87	319	27	4,647	86	4,647	86	319	319
University	269	150,011	2,309	10,836	12	2,466	21	405	281	152,477	2,330	152,477	2,330	11,241	11,241
HIGHER: Lay	365	171,304	2,490	11,970	18	3,075	37	404	383	174,379	2,527	174,379	2,527	12,434	12,434
HIGHER: Dioc. Other . .	84	7,475	597	169	15	1,334	97	8	8	8,809	694	8,809	694	177	177
Non-SJ	1,434	509,754	9,252	22,128	2,336	418,206	1,125	10,488	3,770	927,960	10,377	927,960	10,377	32,616	32,616
HIGHER: SJ	289	10,476	1,696	0	289	10,476	1,696	10,476	1,696	0	0
GRAND TOTAL	1,723	520,230	10,948	22,128	2,336	418,206	1,125	10,488	4,059	938,436	12,073	938,436	12,073	32,616	32,616

Row captions are written in full in Table 5.

Column captions:

(1) (5) (9) ESU = Elementary sampling units, i.e., number of schools which the Society administers.

(2) (6) (10) Enroll = Number of students enrolled, full-time and part-time.

(3) (7) (11) SJ = Unduplicated number of Jesuits who teach and/or administer these schools at least part-time.

(4) (8) (12) N-SJ = Number of teachers and/or administrators who are not Jesuits. Based on province catalogues.

(1) to (4) In schools administered by Jesuits and owned by the Society.

(5) to (8) In schools administered by Jesuits, but in schools the physical plant of which is not owned by the Society.

(9) to (12) Total of (1) to (8).

^a = Full count.

^b = Teacher(s) included under secondary schools.

TABLE 4. Geographic distribution by continent of 878 educational institutions conducted by Jesuits and their 4,059 constituent schools; by ownership, giving enrollment and number of Jesuit and non-Jesuit teachers and/or administrators. Year beginning before January 1961.

CHARACTERISTIC	CONTINENT					
	AFRICA	NORTH AMERICA	SOUTH AMERICA	ASIA, OCEANIA	EUROPE	TOTAL
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
CLUSTERS WITH SCHOOLS:						
Owned by Jesuits	31	117	104	129	255	636
Owned by both	12	40	10	29	15	106
Owned by non-Jesuits	14	58	7	46	11	136
TOTAL Clusters	57	215	121	204	281	878
GRAND TOTAL: Schools	1,009	691	378	1,379	602	4,059
Enrollment	223,692	258,777	87,991	236,661	131,315	938,436
Jesuits teach/administer	625	4,579	1,287	1,873	3,712	12,073
Non-SJ teach/administer	4,091	11,136	4,385	8,526	4,481	32,616
SCHOOLS OWNED BY JESUITS:						
ELEMENTARY Schools: Lay	33	35	71	90	130	359
Enrollment	14,095	12,087	27,094	35,706	35,731	124,713
Jesuits teach/administer	75	61	130	94	237	597
Non-SJ teach/administer	350	301	709	996	1,238	3,594
SECONDARY Schools: Lay	34	102	124	151	215	626
Enrollment	5,452	47,673	28,469	57,086	67,582	206,262
Jesuits teach/administer	244	1,707	765	686	2,166	5,568
Non-SJ teach/administer	303	938	952	1,946	2,257	6,395
HIGHER Schools: Lay	2	196	62	52	53	365
Enrollment	1,147	118,340	12,909	32,482	6,426	171,304
Jesuits teach/administer	12	1,736	123	473	146	2,490
Non-SJ teach/administer	68	7,843	1,889	1,788	382	11,970
HIGHER Schools: Diocesan Other	4	6	7	20	47	84
Enrollment	74	119	562	1,096	5,624	7,475
Jesuits teach/administer	10	37	40	106	404	597
Non-SJ teach/administer	11	0	25	10	123	169
HIGHER Schools: Jesuits	10	65	37	58	119	289
Enrollment	108	3,450	1,094	1,430	4,394	10,476
Jesuits teach/administer	28	572	174	239	683	1,696
Non-SJ teach/administer	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL Schools	83	404	301	371	564	1,723
Enrollment	20,876	181,669	70,128	127,800	119,757	520,230
Jesuits teach/administer	369	4,113	1,232	1,598	3,636	10,948
Non-SJ teach/administer	732	9,082	3,575	4,739	4,000	22,128

(Continued on next page)

TABLE 4. (Continued)

CHARACTERISTIC	AFRICA	NORTH AMERICA	SOUTH AMERICA	ASIA, OCEANIA	EUROPE	TOTAL
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
SCHOOLS NOT OWNED BY JESUITS:						
ELEMENTARY Schools: Lay . . .	835	238	62	947	30	2,112
Enrollment	193,724	69,838	15,205	101,953	10,496	391,216
Jesuits teach/administer . .	170	328	31	159	65	753
Non-SJ teach/administer . .	2,970	1,780	396	3,461	440	9,047
SECONDARY Schools: Lay . . .	87	43	3	50	8	191
Enrollment	8,955	6,434	192	5,938	1,062	22,581
Jesuits teach/administer . .	66	85	3	73	11	238
Non-SJ teach/administer . .	389	267	9	263	41	969
HIGHER Schools: Lay	2	12	4	...	18
Enrollment	33	2,466	576	...	3,075
Jesuits teach/administer	7	21	9	...	37
Non-SJ teach/administer	0	405	59	...	464
HIGHER Schools: Diocesan Other	4	4	...	7	...	15
Enrollment	137	803	...	394	...	1,334
Jesuits teach/administer . .	20	43	...	34	...	97
Non-SJ teach/administer . .	0	7	...	1	...	8
TOTAL Schools	926	287	77	1,008	38	2,336
Enrollment	202,816	77,108	17,863	108,861	11,558	418,206
Jesuits teach/administer . .	256	463	55	275	76	1,125
Non-SJ teach/administer . .	3,359	2,054	810	3,784	481	10,488

NOT OMNIPOTENT

Education is not omnipotent, and can never be a substitute for the sacraments. No system of schools ever devised, can be completely successful in making or keeping a people moral and religious.

—Orestes Brownson: "Public and Parochial Schools"

TABLE 5. Geographic distribution of 4,059 schools administered by Jesuits arranged according to ownership of physical plant and level and type of students educated. School year beginning before January 1961.

LEVEL AND TYPE OF INSTRUCTION	AFRICA		NORTH AMERICA		SOUTH AMERICA	ASIA, OCEANIA	EUROPE	TOTAL	
	SJ	NON	SJ	NON	SJ	NON	SJ	NON	TOTAL
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	
Minor Seminaries	1	2	1	6
Other Non-Standard	1	2	1	2	6	1	28
Standard	31	833	34	236	63	62	73	945	325
ELEMENTARY: Lay	33	835	35	238	71	62	90	947	359
Minor Seminaries	6	1	13	2	30	..	25	3	110
Adult Education	8	1	22	..	16	..	84
Technical, Professional	6	42	5	2	9	..	6	3	38
Other	3	13	1	1	8	..	29
Standard	19	31	75	37	63	3	96	44	5
SECONDARY: Lay	34	87	102	43	124	3	151	50	107
Minor Seminaries	1	2	1	..	3
Adult Education	23	..	4	..	1	..	3
Academic Residences, Other	1	..	1	..	5	4	9
Institutes	1	..	4	..	4	..	4	..	20
University	1	..	167	..	53	12	41	..	14
HIGHER: Lay	2	..	196	2	62	12	52	4	7
HIGHER: Diocesan, Other	4	4	6	4	7	..	20	7	53
Non-SJ	73	926	339	287	264	77	313	1,008	84
HIGHER: SJ	10	..	65	..	37	..	58	..	47
GRAND TOTAL	83	926	404	289	301	77	371	1,008	38
									564
									1,723
									2,336
									3,770
									289
									4,059

SJ (at head of columns) means that the physical plant of the school belongs to the Society. NON means that it does not belong to the Society, but to the diocese or someone else.

TABLE 6. Index numbers for certain characteristics relating to Jesuit-administered education, entire Society, all levels and types of students, by ownership, with detail for number of Jesuits in general. (Base = 100 = 1958)

YEAR	TOTAL NUMBER JESUITS	EDUCATION				
		<i>Institutions</i>	<i>Schools</i>	<i>Enrollment</i>	<i>SJ Teach/ Administer</i>	<i>N-SJ Teach/ Administer</i>
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
TOTAL						
1957.	99	98	66	81
1958.	100	100	100	100	100	100
1959.	101	103	124	112	91	101
1961.	103	108	126	117	94	105
JESUIT OWNED						
1957.	95
1958.	100	100	100	100	100
1959.	102	103	103	91	99
1961.	108	108	112	95	106
NON-JESUIT OWNED						
1957.	61
1958.	100	100	100	100	100
1959.	104	145	123	91	104
1961.	103	145	125	87	102
JESUITS IN FORMATION						
1957.	93	75
1958.	100	100	100	100	...
1959.	102	104	101	106	...
1961.	109	105	101	106	...

- (1) "Total Number Jesuits": Pertains to all Jesuits of all grades whether connected with schools or not.
- (2) "Institutions": Clusters; Rectors (Superiors, etc.) who have at least one school under their charge.
- (3) "Schools": Elementary units (ESU's) which make up institutions.
- (4) "Enrollment": Number of students enrolled, all levels and types, full-time and part-time.
- (5) "SJ Teach/Administer": Number of Jesuits who teach and/or administer; full-time and part-time.
- (6) "N-SJ Teach/Administer": Number of persons other than Jesuits who teach and/or administer; full-time and part-time.

The High School Sodality Dilemma

JOHN E. BECKER, S.J.

Sir:

"For years all I have ever heard, seen, or believed, is that at our school the Sodality is *the* organization. It directed school thought, ideals, principles, activities, projects, or anything that happened at school.

"Now Sodalists themselves seldom strive for the Sodality way of life, or are pushed that way in anything, Sodality itself and studies included.

"These facts are exemplified in the general attitude of Sodalists. The comments on Monday about meetings, the lack of interest, the lack of seriousness, all contribute to the basic fact that something is very, very wrong.

"I have not tried to analyze what is wrong. I don't even pretend to know exactly. But something is wrong. Something is tearing Sodality apart from within, making it a useless, empty, failing organization. We've got to find out what's wrong, where Sodality has missed the boat, what can be done to fix things up. . . .

A SODALITY PREFECT

The above letter from a high school sodalist to his school paper expresses with rare completeness a discouragement with high school sodality work that is a commonplace among a large sampling of Jesuits, at least in certain areas of the United States. High school sodalities are literally besieged with problems. There is the problem of time. Though the high school administration conscientiously keeps certain periods free from other activities, the students attend their sodality meetings more from a sense of duty than from spontaneous enthusiasm. They are much more urgently aware of the beckonings of athletics, publications, speech, and homework. There is the problem of disagreement among moderators on what the sodality ought to require. One man tells his sodalists that the full observance of the rules is necessary for making the public act of consecration; another requires little more than attendance at meetings. The result is disastrous to the sodalists' morale. There is the problem of limited leadership. The limited number of leaders in every high school may be a source of great consolation, but the leaders, just because they are leaders, are certain to be interested in at least one and probably more non-sodality activities; and each activity will be calling on these leaders to spend extra time, to take the initiative, to do the major work

of that organization. There is also the problem of continuity. Some Jesuit directors are more or less permanent members of the faculty. But others are regents with only a three-year or shorter term as directors. The momentary enthusiasm of an active and capable director flashes across the school only long enough to put the inevitably disinterested or poorly equipped successor at a disadvantage.

But there is no profit in merely listing the problems of high school sodalities. They are practical realities facing too many moderators to require listing. But some attempt ought to be made to analyze and group the basic problems of high school sodalities, if for no other reason, at least to clear the air of a lot of useless, impractical discussion. The difficulty is, of course, that no one really has his finger squarely on the whole problem. But this is a matter for cooperative discussion and a tentative analysis can be made. That is what I would like to do here.

Before taking up the analysis of the problem, however, it seems to me that there is one practical premise that must be laid down as a foundation of the discussion. This premise is basic to the psychology of Jesuit spirituality and to the actual historical development of sodalities. It is that the spiritual life is the supernaturalization of the natural function one has in life. The spiritual life is not lived in a vacuum. Nor is it lived very well when it is founded on an unsettled life, one without commitment to an ideal or without settled design and purpose. Rather, spiritual ideals are best lived out as an attempt to make holy one's settled function as the father of a family, as a lawyer, a doctor, a craftsman, a professor. This is a matter of personal experience for each of us as Jesuits. During our training we try to sanctify our lives of study, and then we apply and modify what we have learned when we are faced with the new life of teaching or other active engagement. This is the approach to the spiritual life that we all, eventually end up taking: the sanctification of the intrinsic activities of each assignment. This fundamental premise is also borne out in sodality practice itself. It is by now clear to everyone that the most effective sodalities are adult professional sodalities. And the reasons for their success are their members' settled condition of life, their basic community of interest and talent as members of a particular profession, and, within the normal range of their everyday activities, a broad field of apostolic influence in very fundamental matters like conversion, the rehabilitation of alcoholics, the promotion of social justice. We can include university sodalities in this category to a certain extent because of the community of interest and the special competence which seems to be present among sodalists at a university.

If we are willing to recognize this supernaturalizing of natural activ-

ities as a basic premise of Jesuit life and adult sodality life, we ought also be willing to apply it to the high school sodality. Applying it, perhaps we can find out what is basic in the problems of high school sodalities and what general directions we ought to take in setting up a more effective high school sodality program for both students and moderators.

AN ACTIVITY IN THE ABSTRACT

If we ask ourselves whether high school sodalities are able to supernaturalize the concrete activities in which the students are engaged, we find ourselves tempted to answer no at the outset. The students' concrete activities are too highly diversified and subject to too great fluctuations of interest to be handled competently by a sodality. When it comes to the immediate practical application of supernatural principles to that area in which the boys are most vitally concerned for the moment, we have to admit that the job must be done by the coaches, the speech moderators, the publications moderators. And we can't very well blame them if the application isn't made, since they are bound to be concerned with getting their fundamental jobs done. By the time sodality meetings come around, the practical occasion is long passed or not sufficiently interesting to the whole group to be brought up and considered.

A conceivable solution to this problem would be to diversify the sodality by setting up editorial sodalities, athletic sodalities, literary sodalities, forensic sodalities, and so forth. But a host of new difficulties makes such a step worse than the evil it is trying to correct. A diversification along these lines would tend to divide the school into cliques of athletes, intellectuals, and so on. This sort of thing is bad enough as it is without giving it official recognition in an organization like the sodality. Secondly, there simply aren't enough leaders to permit each branch of school activities to have an elite of its own large enough to form a sodality. Besides, there are a good many students who are members of several activities, a very healthy situation which no one would want to destroy by an impossible classification of sodalists into athletic sodalities, literary sodalities, and so forth. Moderators of activities with their own sodalities would furthermore be likely to slight students who are not up to or interested in the sodality, but who still have a right to the help we can give them in the various branches of extra-curricular activity. Finally, such a situation would have a divisive effect on the school as a whole by tending to create a hyper-awareness of elite groups everywhere. The ability of the students to distinguish this sort of thing from an organized system of favoritism would undoubtedly prove very low.

Yet the temptation toward this impractical form of sodality grouping is very strong in the light of our basic premise. If the sodality cannot attach itself to the individual activities which draw spontaneous interest, it turns out to be a kind of activity in the abstract. This, it seems to me, is true of many present day high school sodalities. The sodalists and the director are presented with the task of organizing a group that has the aim of developing spirituality, a spirituality that must exist at least organizationally separated from the natural activities and crises where supernatural principles must be put into play. The Jesuit director himself has developed his own spirituality, not as an independent, reflexive unit of his thinking, but rather as the sanctification of his specific life work as a student, or some kind of teacher. I have heard Jesuit teachers say more than once, in talking over their difficulties as high school sodality moderators, that they simply didn't know what to do, in spite of elaborate meeting outlines prefabricated and furnished by the administration, in a sodality meeting. Yet they were convinced that they were having, or could have had, influence very like a sodality moderator's influence on the boys they were working with in speech, drama, athletics. After all, as moderators of these activities they are with the students in the arena of activity where crises are really felt, and Catholic principles successfully applied there are not easily forgotten. Jesuits are trained to be specialists of some kind, to be particularly well-informed in law, business, economics, medicine, family life, academic disciplines and so on. They know what to do to conduct meetings of organizations in those areas. They can think in a minute of myriad practical problems that could be tackled as apostolic activities for groups in those areas. But the high school sodality, because it cannot limit itself to the immediate and specific interests of the boys, diversified as they are, leaves both sodalists and moderator in the realms of pure asceticism. The real basis for unity, of course, the reason high schools gather students, is the shared necessity of studying. But this does not constitute in our days and in our country the basis for a spontaneous sense of unity. The fact of his being a "student" has been almost totally obscured in the high school student's emotional attitudes by the much more vividly appreciated ambitions of being an "athlete," a "debater," or an "editor." The fact that high school sodalities cannot count on a common area of shared, spontaneous interest results in a kind of purification of the sodality, a rarification in the direction of the purely spiritual—a lay asceticism detached by the practical necessities of the situation from many of the very activities that most spontaneously appeal to juvenile enthusiasm. The majority of Jesuits, though they are spiritual men and well trained to deal with the problems

of moral living and of becoming a better Catholic, must find it difficult to deal exclusively on the level of pure spirituality and apostolicity. It is much easier to help laymen spiritualize those very activities which we ourselves have specialized in and learned to supernaturalize in everyday crises.

THE APOSTOLATE: TO THE WORLD AND TO THE SCHOOL

Another group of difficulties for high school sodalities centers around the difference between the high school as the student's natural but very narrow field of apostolic activity and the broad fields of apostolic activity open to the adult sodality. The adult group can bring its influence to bear on those members of the community, university, office, or shop community, who are not at all living a Christian life, may not even be Christians. The world is largely non-Catholic, perhaps even largely non-Christian. There is broad room in very fundamental areas for the adult apostolate. But the Jesuit high school is almost totally Catholic. This leaves the sodalists, as far as their natural field of activity is concerned, the school itself, nothing to do but cultivate acts of supererogation among boys already leading, at least in most cases, more than decent lives. The ideals of perfection and supererogation, hard to grasp and hard to present for any apostle at any age level, are virtually impossible for the high school boy to grasp in such a way as to be able to promote them as apostolic activity within his natural community.

Again, the adult's sphere of influence in university, office, or shop brings him into contact with a fair number of adults who, though their lives are beginning to seem like radical failures, are mature enough to realize it and be alert to the need for help. Some of them are receptive to help offered rightly by their equals. But it is quite obvious that an adolescent boy is peculiarly unsusceptible to exhortation, advice, or apostolic pushings from a fellow student. Where does this leave the high school sodalist in trying to be apostolic within his natural community? It leaves him with an extremely subtle job, one which demands great skill and indirection. The only good he can hope to do within his school, when faced with the already prevalent Catholicism and basic morality of his schoolmates along with their reluctance to respond to any direct approach, is to be accomplished by building up a social atmosphere. He must try to make the right things become the "O. K." things to do as far as the group is concerned. This sort of indirect social influence is clearly beyond the competence of most adult apostles. How can it be considered a practical possibility for the high-schooler?

The sodalist's apostolate in his home and parish is more an individual one. It is his individual response, in situations in which his fellow sodalists are not working with him as a group, to the spirituality he has learned. It is the group apostolate of the sodality that has to give the sodalist his basic training in group activity and a sense of the value and strength of organized efforts. Works of mercy outside the school furnish an opportunity for such training. Still, if we grant the basic premise that the spiritual life must attempt to spiritualize the concrete and immediate, it seems that sodalities will have to be bound up closely to an apostolate within the circle of the daily activities which engages the student's special competence, time, and interest.

SPECIAL PROBLEMS OF THE JESUIT MODERATOR

So much for the problems shared by the moderator and his high school sodalists. For the Jesuit himself there is the very basic difficulty that sodality work is not taken for granted by him and by his fellow students and teachers during his training. From the beginning every Jesuit prepares, at least psychologically, for the work of preaching, hearing confessions, giving retreats. The work of the sodality remains on the fringe. In the minds of many it is a kind of optional icing, a side interest that one may or may not develop, like the ability to coach speech, or athletic teams. When questions of moral theology, retreat-giving, preaching are raised, Jesuits are likely to have and to express good, or at least pragmatically tested, opinions on the matter. They may eventually refer the questioner to a more competent authority, but all know that they ought to have, and most actually have developed, competence and worthwhile opinions in these areas. But to sodality problems the response is often a wordless gesture of impatience or of disinterest. The result is that young men who, out of admiration for Jesuits they have known, decide to imitate them by becoming Jesuits, also imitate them in their attitude to the various jobs Jesuits are given to do. Young Jesuits pick up the attitude that the sodality is not a very significant part of our work, or at least not a very necessary part, and often feel at a loss to cope with a sodality when they reach high school work.

But what they feel is more than the inherent difficulty of the task, which nothing can alleviate. Everyone feels somewhat at a loss when faced with the prospect of giving his first retreat, his first sermon, and so forth. But in spite of difficulties, the fact that he is going to have to face that sort of situation more or less matter-of-factly all through his life forces him to put up a good fight to do well. But faced with the sodality

he is really at a loss. He has not taken it for granted beforehand that sodality work in some form or other will be his work, and he isn't convinced that it will continue to be his work for very long. He lacks the motivation to put up a good fight. Yet the sodality way of life is nothing extraordinary; it is only Jesuit spirituality for the layman. There is nothing specialized or *récherché* about it, at least not for a Jesuit. If it has its peculiarities, they are Jesuit peculiarities, things with which he is certainly familiar. Where is the difficulty? It rests again with the difficulty of applying our basic premise. The spiritual organization exists in a state of divorce from the natural round of activities and skills that each Jesuit feels himself competent in. The high school sodality seems to have no relation to what he is a specialist in or even merely good at. And he has no time to sit down and formalize Jesuit spirituality into a set of concepts adapted to very young laymen for use in instructions, discussions, apostolic activities independent of individual fields of interest and competence.

ARE THERE ANY ANSWERS?

Are there any answers to these problems? Certainly there are not yet any clear ones.

It is clear, of course, that individual Jesuits, because of special training or talent at conducting sodalities, can bypass all of these problems; in fact, make them look rather trivial. But because individual brilliance is rarely to be expected, the overall, long-term vitality of a high-school sodality *movement* depends on some kind of resolution of these difficulties. Within this broader context a solution to these problems demands a pragmatic evolution of principles and a gradual systematization of the techniques of conducting a sodality into a teachable pattern that can be handed down to the large majority of us who need this kind of assistance.

One problem, however, has to be faced before all the rest. If there is going to be any progress in working out the problems of the high school sodality, Jesuits have to be educated to accept the sodality matter-of-factly as an inevitable reality, a Jesuit reality connected intimately or remotely with every Jesuit's life, and not the mere hobby of sodality specialists. For this to take place he is going to have to be presented with the sodality in its successful form. It is too sadly true that our high school sodalities are not for the most part successful; and even if they are successful preparatory sodalities or transitional-sodalities, they will inevitably fall short of the sodality ideal envisioned in the rule. Yet, it is a fact that nowadays most Jesuits get their first look at the sodality in high school work. This must be why there is so much despair and disinterest

abroad with respect to the sodality. Consequently, in preparing Jesuits for sodality work, all the emphasis is going to have to be on the adult professional sodality as the normative sodality. Jesuits will have to be thoroughly propagandized with reports on the efficacy and apostolic richness of the works of these adult sodalists. The whole notion of the sodality as a way of life will have to be derived from these adult sodalities, because only adults have made a life-long commitment to marriage and to some profession or occupation. They are, therefore, in a position to begin a long-term effort at supernaturalizing, in a particular and concrete way proper to their more or less permanent way of life, their life, and using it as a specific opportunity for spreading the kingdom of Christ throughout the world they reach in their daily living. This is a problem of simple, but commonsense propaganda. It is not a new suggestion that the adult sodality be the norm and not the exception. It has already become that to many who are devoted to sodality work. But it hasn't been used enough in forming the attitudes of Jesuits toward sodalities. If it were, perhaps despair and disinterest would turn into prudent hope and enthusiasm, along with greater patience with the failings of high school sodalities.

The second problem is the training of Jesuit scholastics so that their enthusiasm can survive the special difficulties of a high school sodality. It ought to be recognized, I think, that there is no training that can adequately prepare a man for running his own sodality except personal experience. And personal experience can only be gained efficiently and with the minimum of personal crises by apprenticeship to an experienced director. The present scholastic moderators of high school sodalities are, I think, moderators by default, default of enough priests who have grown up sufficiently acquainted with the papal reorientation of the sodality or who have been able to take the time to organize their approach around these comparatively recent developments. As the present generation of scholastics begins to augment the present nucleus of good priest moderators there should be some reduction of pressure on new regents. It ought to become more and more routine for them to be apprenticed to experienced priest moderators, which should obviate the despair that comes from being on one's own with an admittedly impossible situation.

Thirdly, the high school sodalities themselves are going to have to take fuller account of their status as preparatory sodalities for the fully realized adult sodality. This function of preparation for a future ideal sodality life has not yet come fully into its own in the minds of either sodalists or moderators. The reason is simple and absolves everyone of guilt. There are not enough immediately available adult sodalities for a moderator in

high school to prepare his sodalists for. Present-day high school sodalists have a comparatively small chance of finding an adult sodality to which they can belong after high school. Imagine, however, how strong and healthy the influence of an adult sodality could be if sodalists realized that they were preparing themselves to enter sodalities such as those their fathers or brothers are already active in. Such a situation as this is not too fantastic to envision. The sodality movement may never be a mass movement, but certainly its ideal form, the adult professional sodality, is capable of a good deal more growth, numerically. As it grows, it should become a practical ideal for the high school sodalist to shoot for. Unless the high school sodalist can ambition membership in such a sodality, I think high school sodality work is bound to be ineffectual.

We come finally to the underlying problem for both sodalist and moderator in the high school sodality: the dichotomy between the sodality and the natural interests and areas of influence of high school sodalists, or the impossibility of applying our basic spiritual premise. The present diversity of interests in high school activity is certainly one of the good things about high school training. Diversity of interest is necessary to education, to the student's exploration of his own capabilities. But what is detrimental in this to the sodality, and perhaps it is detrimental, too, to the whole educational task, is the fact that our students spontaneously feel that their extracurricular activities are more immediately rewarding, practical, interesting than their curricular activities. Consequently, they lack awareness of themselves precisely as a group of "students," a single large group with a large number of problems and talents in common. They know that they all come to school to learn. But they feel their spontaneous interests and sympathies belong with their fellows in their extracurricular activities. While this situation exists the sodality will have to go on leading its quasi-independent existence as a spiritual organization more or less unable to work on school society as a cohesive unit because of the variegated, even distracting, variety of interests of its members and of the student body. If, however, the present upsurge of interest in academic education were to continue, it might eventuate in a salutary unification of the students' attitudes toward their life in school. Advanced standing programs with universities have already begun to exert their influence on student attitudes toward high school studies. Perhaps students will commence to think of themselves first of all as students and develop a more and more spontaneous interest in specifically student problems, ambitions, and objectives. This would be a great boon to the high school sodality. It could then take up its position right down in the main arena of student interest and activity, supernaturalizing the desire

for success in studies, spreading charity by organizing special helps for slower students, for students without sufficient money, sponsoring intellectual activities and cultural events as expressions of the supernaturalized desire to cultivate those objectives for which schools exist, promoting the study of problems which will increase intelligent participation in the social functions of the community. This sort of sodality organization any Jesuit with his broad intellectual background would probably feel competent to handle, or at least to cooperate in because of an occasional need for his particular special training. It is no longer a purely spiritual activity that he becomes engaged in, but the activity of a teacher helping his students to live supernatural lives precisely as students, the job he has been preparing himself for all his life both in the natural and the supernatural order. Whether such an evolution toward specifically student ideals in our schools ever takes place or not, it still seems to be the only hope for making the high school sodality a reasonably concrete and practical kind of organization for a Jesuit to run, and a reasonable preparation for the admittedly ideal sodality, the adult professional sodality.

CONCLUSION

In all events, it is a matter of primary importance that the present activity of sodalities, sodality moderators, and sodality experts continue. Nothing is to be gained by consenting to a fashionable, rec-room despair at the lack of effectiveness of so many present-day high school sodalities; and nothing is to be gained by advocating the suspension of high school sodality activity until the intellectual objectives are clarified. In all affairs of practical importance, it is the evolution of a practical system that one tries to promote. What we are all committed to try for, through our own enlightened or stumbling efforts to conduct vital sodalities, is the practical evolution of an organized and stable sodality organization for supernaturalizing the growth of students toward adulthood. Then the high school sodality will not depend on the momentary enthusiasm and ability of a few competent but isolated moderators; and the real sodality, the sodality which supernaturalizes adult activity, can have members who have been trained from their high school years to see God in every activity of their daily lives.

News from the Field

PERSONS

Harry L. (Bing) Crosby, class of 1925 of Gonzaga University, was named a founder of Gonzaga University at the Diamond Jubilee commencement exercises on May 27. In naming Bing Crosby as a founder of the University, Gonzaga announced that his contributions had not been limited to the building of the Crosby Library, which was a contribution of over \$800,000, but that Mr. Crosby had also contributed generously to the fund of the new engineering building.

STUDIES

Gonzaga High School of Washington, D. C., under the direction of Rev. Robert F. Mullan, S.J., will cooperate with Georgetown University in a Biological Sciences Seminar. The National Science Foundation has expressed interest in the idea of the Seminar and has asked Father Mullan to submit an application to the Foundation for a grant to continue the Seminar for the summer of 1963.

The interest generated by the Seminar had already had concrete results in the excellent record made by Gonzaga High School in the Science Writing Awards.

A student of Chaplain Kapaun Memorial High School of Wichita, Kansas, scored first place with a perfect score of 100 points in the 1962 National Spanish contest sponsored by the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese. The student is under the direction of Father Robert De Rouen, S.J.

The James Henry Yalem Scientific Computing Center was dedicated at St. Louis University April 10, 1962.

The Center is built around a compact IBM 1620 high-speed electronic data processing computer which contains features formerly found only in larger systems. It will be devoted mainly to research by faculty and graduate students.

A gift of \$100,000 from Charles H. Yalem, president of the Aetna Finance Co., made the Center possible through IBM's University program. Mr. Yalem presented the gift through the Charles H. Yalem

Foundation in memory of his son, who lost his life while serving in the U. S. Air Force in World War II.

The basic 1620 computer includes 20,000 digits of magnetic core storage, with card-punch, paper tape, and electric typewriter input and output devices. An additional 40,000 units of data storage are included in the Yalem gift, providing the Center with a computer capable of handling 60,000 units of information. This storage feature makes the computer unusually versatile, and combined with a transistorized processing system, accounts for its ability to solve problems in minutes that otherwise might require weeks to calculate.

Dr. Oliver F. Anderhalter, professor of education and director of the Yalem Computing Center, has said that the computer's significance to education lies in the fact that it gives the student more time for creative thinking by eliminating what were formerly tedious hours of mathematical calculation.

The ability to follow detailed instructions exactly to handle large quantities of data makes the computer adaptable to both research and administrative problems. Faculty and students create detailed instructions in solving their problems by using the IBM Fortran language. This language lets the user present his problem in mathematical terms and the 1620 will create the detailed program to solve the problem.

As an example of its application to University administrative problems, Dr. Anderhalter pointed out that test score processing on desk type calculators required hours, but can be done now in seconds by the 1620 computer. He emphasized that the computer is primarily for research and not for shortcutting business practices.

One such area in which the Computing Center will play an important role is seismology. Long the center of activity for the network of Jesuit seismological stations, the University will use the equipment to make accurate and speedy computations of earthquake centers, a process that previously involved long and tedious operations.

'ABSOLUTELY SUPERIOR'

And first of all education belongs pre-eminently to the Church, by reason of a double title in the supernatural order, conferred exclusively upon her by God Himself; absolutely superior therefore to any other title in the natural order.

—Pope Pius XI

